THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XI OCTOBER, 1925 No. 64

EDITORIAL

SOUTHAMPTON AND TENNESSEE

The recent meeting of the British Association at Southampton was the occasion for an utterance by the President, Professor Horace Lamb, which is of more than ordinary interest, alike in what it claims and in what it refuses to claim for science; and it may serve as an apt comment from this side of the Atlantic on the issues underlying the celebrated trial in Tennessee. After alluding to the momentous results achieved by science on the intellectual side, the President said:

> Authority and science were at one time in conflict over matters entirely within the province of the latter. The weapons were keen and the strife bitter. We may rejoice that these antagonists are now almost obsolete; one side has become more tolerant, the other less aggressive, and there is a disposition on both sides to respect each other's territories.

The last phrase is particularly significant, as it points to a principle of far-reaching application. It points to the recognition of theology as a valid field of knowledge side by side with those which are commonly called scientific. We may say, if we like, that theology has an entirely distinct subject-matter—those "new facts," in short, which William James said were characteristic of supernatural religion. Or, we may say that theology deals with many of the same facts as science—the facts of Nature, and especially of human nature—but deals with them from its own angle and by its own principles. Both alike are true. For theology and science are constructions of reality, each valid within its own sphere, overlapping and interpenetrating one another at some points, at others going their several ways independently.

Professor Lamb was equally telling in what he said of the limitations of science as a practical guide to life.

> It seems to be suggested that science has held out promises which it has been impotent to fulfil. It may be admitted that extravagant claims have sometimes been made on behalf of science, but never, I think, by

the real leaders, who have always been guarded in their forecasts. It is true, again, that in the enthusiasm which attended the first sensational developments of modern industry hopes were conceived of a new era, where prosperity would ever increase, poverty would be at least mitigated and refined, national antipathies would be reconciled. When these dreams did not swiftly come true there was the inevitable reaction, the idols were cast down, and science in general has rather unreasonably come in for its share of depreciation.

Is it not true to say that the fallacy which is here so justly disowned was what underlay the dominant philosophy of the Edwardine age? If we had to name it we might call it the philosophy of Progress, as that was being preached from scores of pulpits and platforms during the decade before the war. Only as late as 1894, Huxley had pointed out in the Prolegomena to his *Evolution and Ethics* that science held out no such hopes of an Earthly Paradise; but it was supposed that he was out of date, and had not realized how vast were the potentialities of science when allied to a strong political party. The President of the British Association sums up in a few sentences the lesson which the war taught his countrymen on this score:

> [Science] can have no pretensions to improve human nature; it may alter the environment, multiply the resources, widen the intellectual prospect, but it cannot fairly be asked to bear the responsibility for the use which is made of these gifts. That must be determined by other and higher considerations.

In other words, science is ethically neutral.

There is, however, one spiritual value other than the purely intellectual values which Professor Lamb claims for science; and here too he has our entire sympathy.

> We may claim for this constructive task (he says) something of an æsthetic character. The provinces of art and science are often held to be alien and even antagonistic, but in the higher processes of scientific thought it is often possible to trace an affinity. . . . Is it not the case that the widespread interest excited by the latest achievements of physical science is due not to the hope of future profit, though this will doubtless come, but to the intrinsic beauty as well as the novelty of the visions which they unfold?

Anyone who has ever done an exacting piece of work in theology knows the fascination of which the President speaks.

We said above that the address to which we have alluded has a bearing upon the issues of the Tennessee trial. We are not sure that those issues have been fully appreciated. It has been said, for instance, that the real issue was the right of parents to protect the religion of their children from teaching hostile to it. So far as that goes, the right, no doubt, must

be maintained; but in our judgment the issue is unduly narrowed when it is so put. We have got to go further and ask why it is that all America is agog about a matter which has been settled in the educational system of this country without any trials at all. Let no one mistake the seriousness of the situation, if the Tennessee verdict is upheld. It means the quite deliberate withholding from the young of established scientific truth in the supposed interests of religion. Whether a modern State can contemplate such a policy we will not say. But for the Church to contemplate it we do not hesitate to say would be madness. For it means that, directly the young are freed from the school teaching and able to learn and think for themselves, they will discover that their religion is bound up with a theory of man's origins which no educated man can accept; and that is the surest way to make shipwreck of faith.

What, then, is the cause of the dilemma? The cause, unless we are greatly mistaken, is to be found in the fact that the schools in America are secular. It is one of the ironies of circumstance that conditions which are created mainly in order to rule out the difficulties attendant upon religious differences should in fact have given rise to one of the bitterest and most widespread religious controversies of our time. And the fact points a moral. It exhibits in unmistakable form the intrinsic inconstancy of secular education. It shows it to be, in fact, self-contradictory and self-destructive. Designed to exclude all questions of faith, it only succeeds in letting them in with a rush, in a veritable mêlée of affirmations and denials, a fog of journalistic exaggeration and political jobbery. Tennessee is the inevitable fruit of a type of education which is based on what psychologists call "repression." Under a secular system all the ultimate questions which the human soul asks—questions of man's origin, nature, condition, and destiny—those questions, in short, which all the greatest educators of mankind from Plato onwards have regarded as giving to their task its peculiar character and end—all these are deliberately repressed; and their place is taken by a series of arid silences, of half-truths and make-believes, of evasions and hollow ideals. What wonder if men reap the whirlwind, when they sow such a storm?

And if we ask how it is that we in England have avoided such a dilemma, the answer is to be found pre-eminently in the connection of our whole educational system, from University to village school, with the historic and living Church. It is not merely that the system is not secular; nor even that the

Bible is taught in all schools, for that may mean much or little. The key to the situation, rather, lies in the fact that throughout a great part of our educational system runs the recognition, first, that matters of faith are the proper basis of education; and, second, that in matters of faith the Church "hath authority." At the time, that is to say, when the Bible and science appeared to be in conflict in this country, the Church was there to say in what sense the Bible and its different parts should be received, read, and taught. The guidance was not given at once or unanimously; but from the beginning there were theologians of recognized standing able and willing to lead the way; and within a generation the working synthesis of which Professor Lamb spoke at Southampton had been effected. Not only were territories demarcated between religion and science, but in the Scriptures themselves history and parable were discriminated, and the kind of truth implicit in each made plain; and the teacher was set free to teach his pupils that, while they were on one side the product of evolution, they were on another—and that the more momentous—the children of God and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven.

That is, in brief, the answer we should give to the question put to us by a correspondent in Canada as to how a parish priest should present this issue to his people. Science and religion represent different and complementary constructions of reality; and we must accustom the faithful to pay due tribute to each. In the case of the narratives of Creation, for instance, we must insist that these are not scientific descriptions of cosmic and human origins, but revelations of truth conveyed in the form of stories. Their best analogue is to be found in the parables of our Lord. We do not ask of a parable whether its story actually happened; whether, for example, there was a particular Samaritan who found a wounded man on the road to Jericho, or a particular marriage at which some of the company forgot to bring oil for their lamps. We forbear to ask those questions, not because we doubt whether the facts related happened once, but because we know that they happen over and over again. They are facts of our everyday experience—the most certain facts, that is to say, of which we have any knowledge. So is it with the great parables of Genesis. We do not go to Genesis for the details of evolution, but to learn what science can never teach—that every stage of the creative process was and is dependent on the will of God; that man's essential character consists in his likeness to God who made him a living soul in His own image; and that his destiny is to share the eternal life of his Creator.

Such a treatment involves inevitably a certain detachment from the letter of Scripture in order that its spirit may be grasped. The purpose of Christ's parables in the first instance was to make men think; and the Church was built out of those who had the spiritual insight to pierce to His real meaning, and lay hold of the universal truths which He was teaching. What happened in the last century, when Huxley began to popularize Darwinism, was that the Church was taken by surprise. It had conceived itself the slave, instead of the inspired possessor and interpreter, of a Book, and had not realized the diversity of modes in which, even within the limits of a single book of Scripture, the revelation of God was given. The discovery of this meant much more than a coming to terms with science: it meant a new appreciation of the whole Bible itself.

What made this possible, let us repeat, was the recognition of the Church's living authority in matters of faith. It was not the Bible, but the interpretation of the Bible, that was the key to the situation. The position was saved—and will be saved during the educational changes which lie ahead of us to-day—because the standard of religious teaching was set, not by the State, nor by individuals, whether parents or teachers, but by the Church, in touch at once with the experience of grace through the Gospel and with the growing knowledge acquired from science.

Many names occur to us among those of theologians who contributed to the new attitude towards the Bible; but none springs more readily to mind to-day than that of the late Dean of Westminster. Bishop Ryle had in a peculiar degree the qualities needed in one who was to dissolve theological prejudices. Lovable to an unusual degree and increasingly as the years wore on; of great personal dignity and charm; nursed in the lap of Evangelical orthodoxy, yet able to assimilate all that Eton and King's in the seventies could give of learning, humanity, and imagination, he brought a new focus into play for the understanding of the Old Testament, and did much to make its critical study an established tradition at Cambridge. Such men commend the truth of the Gospel to their generation. Their influence through every vein of the nation's spiritual life is inestimable, their loss not easily nor quickly repaired. The place of his grave in the nave of Westminster Abbey is an apt symbol of how closely the task of the theologian is bound up with the things of most enduring influence in the history of England.

WHAT IS THE GOSPEL?*

It is a question of far-reaching importance which is before us. The Gospel—what is it, and how should it be proclaimed to the people of our towns and villages to-day? St. Paul speaks of the Gospel almost as if it were a living and personal thing. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom. i. 16). Indeed, so convinced does he seem to be that the Gospel has a power of its own, distinct from the personal character of those who preach it, that, as he shows in his Epistle to the Philippians, he would rather that it were proclaimed "of faction, not sincerely" (Phil. i. 17, 18), than that it should not be proclaimed at all. It is a great thing to be "entrusted with the Gospel"—a great thing now, as then. But do we always clearly understand what the Gospel is? What precisely is that message which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth? My own work has been rather the work of a teacher than that of an evangelist, but the problem concerns us all, and light may fall upon it from many sides. My main purpose will be practical. I want to help you, if it may be so, in your practical work to-day.

I

Now may I begin with a distinction which seems to me of great importance? It is the distinction between the Gospel and the Faith; or, to put it in another way, the distinction between the message of the evangelist and the fuller instruction which belongs to the teacher. By the Gospel I mean the proclamation which we are sent to make to those who do not yet believe; by the Faith I mean the whole body of truth which we have to convey to the members of the Church. There is much contained in the Faith with which only believing Christians are concerned. No doubt the Gospel itself may imply more than it directly proclaims; the Faith is a great whole, and it is difficult rightly to apprehend any part of it without in some degree apprehending the rest. But it is not necessary that all the implications of the Gospel should be recognized before we accept it. Let me give you two examples. As we shall presently see, the central truth of the apostolic Gospel is that Jesus is the Christ, and its primary call is to faith in Him, and baptism into the company of His people. It is, I

* The substance of a lecture delivered at the Oxford Summer School for Clergy in July, 1925.

should maintain, quite true that Jesus could not be the Christ that the Gospel maintains Him to be unless His personal relation to God were profoundly different from ours. But it does not follow, that it is necessary to convince men of His Divinity before His saving power is known. Indeed, it may be that in the saving power of Christ we begin to know for the first time what for us Divinity chiefly means. Again, it is, I should maintain, quite true that it could not be necessary to be baptized into the Church unless the Church were something immeasurably greater than a merely human society. But it does not follow that we must understand the nature of the Church before we enter it. What the Church is, what the relations are into which it brings us with the Lord and the Spirit, we shall, best know when we share its fellowship. So it is with a great many other things. What has a heathen man to do with theories about the Atonement, or with such Christian institutions as Penance or the Eucharist? But do we English clergy always understand this? We ourselves were brought up as Christians, and have learned the Faith as a connected whole. We may never have seen the power of the Gospel, when it comes to those who know little or nothing of God. We have our favourite truths, the truths about which we speak most easily. Are we not sometimes in too great a hurry to reach them, and a little disposed to ask our hearers to run before they can walk? There is great wisdom in St. Paul's reserve, his refusal to give anything but milk to babes, or to impart the deeper Christian truth to his converts, until they can show some advance in Christian character.

But how, you may say, are we to distinguish? Is it just a matter of common sense, or can we find some external guidance? I would suggest that the Acts of the Apostles contains outlines of mission sermons by no less successful preachers than St. Peter and St. Paul; and a good many references to evangelistic preaching, even when the Gospel is not directly being preached. Can we not here learn much of what the Gospel, as distinguished from the Faith, contains? Of course, I am aware of what is commonly said about the sermons in the Acts. They are said to give us a primitive type of Christian teaching, to be contrasted with the later and more developed teaching of St. Paul and St. John. St. Peter, like the proverbial deacon, put all that he knew into his first sermon. Let us, for the sake of argument, suppose that it was so. Is it not probable that what the Apostles grasped first is what others need to grasp first? But if, as is perhaps more probable, St. Peter knows a good deal more than he explicitly says, the situation is even plainer; we ought to find his sermons very

helpful for our purpose. No doubt caution will be necessary. All the Gospel sermons of the Acts, with the exception of that delivered to the Athenians on Mars Hill, were delivered to Jews, or to Gentiles who had been closely associated with the Jews; and the Jews possessed a knowledge of the Old Testament which is wanting to those whom we address to-day, and—at any rate in Palestine—a knowledge of the life and experience of the Lord which may be almost equally wanting. Our work is thus more difficult than that of the Apostles. We shall not imitate their frequent references to prophecy; we shall have carefully to teach Old Testament truths, which they could take for granted; and include in our preaching much more information about our Lord's life and work. But still the example of the Apostles ought greatly to help us. I shall consider three questions. First, what was the preparatory Gospel which the Lord preached in the towns and villages of Galilee? Secondly, what was the Gospel which the Apostles preached after the Lord had ascended? Thirdly, how far ought we ourselves to be preaching the same Gospel to-day?

II

We begin, then, with the first question. That the Lord did preach a Gospel which found an enthusiastic welcome among His hearers there can be no doubt. It is true that the thousands who at first followed Him were attracted by His gracious personality, and by His power to heal; but they were not attracted by these things alone. His message appealed to them; they wondered at "the words of grace" which proceeded out of His mouth. But when we inquire what those words were we find a difficulty. The four Gospels were written for Christians; they presuppose that the evangelistic message is already known and believed. They give us much of the Lord's moral teaching, much of what He said privately to the Apostles, and many of those parables by which He illustrated His meaning, or sometimes for a time concealed it from the multitude. None of these things would find any large place in the evangelistic preaching. The Lord's Gospel, on the other hand, was included in the Gospel of the Apostles, and so was already known. But I think that we shall be able to surmount our difficulty. The Gospel is always substantially the same, though it grows fuller and clearer with the passing of the years. The Old Testament will help us; the words of the Lord, even as we have them, will help us; and the Gospel of the Apostles will throw back its light over all that has gone before.

How is the Gospel preached by Our Lord described in our

authorities? It is described as the Gospel of the Kingdom. "Jesus went about all Galilee teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom" (Matt. iv. 23; xiii. 19). His word is "the word of the kingdom." All the Synoptic Gospels agree as to this. Here is the account of St. Mark: "Now after that John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel." The central truth of Our Lord's preaching to the multitude was not the Fatherhood of God; nor was it the redemption which by the Cross He was to win. The great subject of His preaching was the Kingdom of God. If in St. Matthew's account we find more often "the kingdom of heaven," probably there is no difference in meaning. The Jews of Our Lord's day from reverence used to substitute the word "heaven" for "God." When the prodigal son says, "I have sinned against heaven," we find another example of this usage.

So far, then, all is clear. When, however, we ask what Our Lord meant by the Kingdom of God, we raise a question of some complexity. Did the Lord speak of a kingdom to be established in this present world, or of a kingdom to come at the consummation of all things? If it was the former of which He spoke, did He refer to a visible kingdom, or to an invisible kingdom in the souls of men? Was this kingdom to come suddenly by the act of God, or was it to come gradually as the free wills of men co-operated with the grace of God to bring it? There are many questions which arise, and we may find sayings of the Lord which seem to suggest conflicting answers to them. How, then, shall we proceed? We shall consider first the natural meaning of the phrase; secondly, the Jewish expectations to which the Lord's teaching attached itself; and, thirdly, the teaching and action of the Lord.

We observe then, first, that the word "kingdom" would not convey to Our Lord's contemporaries exactly the idea that it conveys to us. When we speak of the kingdom of England, or of the kingdom of Italy, we think of a tract of country ruled by a particular king. But to an Eastern the word would have little to do with geography. It would mean rather "rule" or "sovereignty," the rule or sovereignty which a king exercises; or—in a more concrete sense—that rule as already embodied in those who accept it. When, *e.g.*, Obadiah says that "the kingdom shall be the Lord's," he means that God will be King, and no one else.

Now it is this meaning of "sovereignty" or "rule" that we must carry in our minds as we examine Our Lord's teaching.

Our Lord's first hearers were Jews; and it was necessary for Him to begin with ideas already present in their minds. We may teach men much that is new to them; but we must always attach what is new to what is already familiar. If we do not, our words find no foothold, and are at once forgotten. Our Lord, the wisest and best of teachers, took men where He found them, and built upon the foundation ready to His hand. He might correct and transform current ideas; He might give to old words a new and deeper meaning; but from the old He necessarily began. Thus, in order to understand what He meant by the Kingdom of God, we must first ask what His hearers would understand Him to mean. They, as we have seen, meant by the kingdom of God the rule of God, and Our Lord, we may be sure, meant that also. His Gospel was that God was about to establish His own rule, and that under that rule all the evils from which men were suffering would pass away. That is what we require above all else, the rule of God Himself. Rule there must be, and human rule is a ghastly failure. That is why all forms of it are so unstable. We may live under an absolute monarchy, or under an oligarchy, or under a rule "of the people for the people by the people"; but whatever rule we have, we are always hankering after a different one, because we find what we have so unsatisfactory. So, as Aristotle taught us long ago, the various possible forms of human rule succeed one another in a regular order. We go from monarchy to oligarchy, and from oligarchy to democracy; and then in despair back to monarchy again. Nor do we find any improvement if we try to abolish human rule over us, and rule ourselves. Rule by ourselves is only another form of human rule; we do not rule ourselves any better than other people rule us. What we really require is the rule of justice, and wisdom, and holiness, and love; and it is only the rule of God that will provide it. There is no news so good as that the time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God at hand; and that is the Gospel that the Lord taught.

But now we must look back a little. If we speak in this way to our people to-day, our words will not seem to them very practical. They may value the Divine rule and guidance very highly, and by prayer seek after it for themselves. But they will not be accustomed to think of this Divine rule as contrasted with human rule; rather they will think of it as existing upon an altogether different plane. With Our Lord's hearers it was not so. They knew that the Kingdom or rule of God was intended to be embodied in their own national life. Ideally, Israel's constitution was neither monarchical, nor aristocratic, nor democratic, but theocratic. God had chosen

Israel out of all nations to be the sphere of His rule, and so of His peculiar blessing. He Himself had undertaken towards it the kingly office in its every aspect; He Himself was its law-giver, its Judge, its Protector, responsible, while His people were obedient, for the supply of their every need. That is why we find such a dislike of human kingship in Gideon, and Samuel, and Hosea, and such a suspicion of it in the book of Deuteronomy; the human kingship was felt to be only too likely to obscure and supplant the Divine. Israel was intended to stand out against the dark background of the heathen world as a people faithful to Yahweh their king, and enjoying an unexampled prosperity under His rule; and so in time to attract all nations to Him. Our Lord Himself recognizes the Divine calling of Israel. He calls Jerusalem "the city of the great King"; He says that "salvation is from the Jews"; He gives to the Jews the title of "the sons of the kingdom"; He warns them that, if they reject His message, "the kingdom of God will be taken away from them, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." But though all this was true, we can hardly say that this was the normal standpoint of the prophets of the Old Testament. For, though Israel was in the Divine intention the sphere of the Divine rule, it had been very far from being so in fact. The sin of God's people had postponed the fulfilment of the Divine intention; it had made them rather a monument of the Divine severity than of the Divine blessing. Thus the prophets had looked forward to the Kingdom of God rather as a great blessing to be bestowed in the future than as one actually enjoyed in the present. God had not cast off His people which He foreknew. Prostrate as at present they may be under the feet of their enemies, the purpose of God stands sure. But the Divine purpose cannot be fulfilled in the people as they are. They must be purified by judgment; it is only "the remnant" that will be saved. When "the day of the Lord" comes, judgment will not fall upon the heathen only, but also upon Israel itself. The chaff will be burned with unquenchable fire, and only the wheat gathered into the garner. But one day the blessing of God's Kingdom will come. One day the God of Israel, either Himself or through the Messiah, whom He will send, will bring in His kingdom; and all evils alike, spiritual evils like sin, and physical evils like suffering and poverty and oppression, will pass away.

Now it was to this expectation that the Lord's Gospel plainly attached itself. The good news which aroused so great an enthusiasm was that the waiting-time was over, and the Kingdom of God at hand. He spoke, as the Baptist did,

plainly and repeatedly, of the judgment; do not let modern writers persuade you that Our Lord was not a prophet of judgment to come. But though the Lord carried on the message of the Baptist, there was, I would suggest, this great difference between them, that, while with the Baptist the judgment was more prominent than the Kingdom, with the Lord the Kingdom was more prominent than the judgment. That is why the Lord's message glowed and uplifted, as the Baptist's never did. Look at St. Luke's account of Our Lord's preaching at Nazareth, the nearest approach that we have to an account of Our Lord's preaching to the crowd. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He anointed Me to preach good tidings to the poor: He hath sent Me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord" (Luke iv. 18). Is that what we should call a Messianic prophecy? Hardly that. The words speak rather of a prophet proclaiming in glowing language the coming of the Kingdom. That, you will find, was all that Our Lord at first claimed to be. His Gospel was the Gospel of the Kingdom, and not at first the Gospel of the King. It was the Gospel of the Old Testament prophets, preached with a beauty and power unknown before. So the Lord goes from city to city, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, and calling men to repentance that they may escape the impending judgment. and be ready for the blessing drawing near. Very strict are the Lord's moral demands; it is here that much of His moral teaching finds its place; unless men's righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, they will in no wise enter into the Kingdom of God. It is hard to enter in, He says; for the rich almost impossible. The Kingdom is a pearl of great price, and we must be ready to sacrifice all to gain it. But it is coming, and that immediately, and no member of God's people, whatever his past, need be excluded from it. The Lord is only sent yet to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But within Israel, He is sent to all: not only to those devoutly watching and waiting for the consolation of Israel, not only to Pharisees faithful to the law, but to the despised "people of the land," and to the very outcasts. If they will repent, the Kingdom is for them as for others. That is the point of the parables of recovery—the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, the Prodigal Son. Their immediate application is to Israel alone. As all Our Lord's hearers knew, God's flock is Israel, His treasure Israel, and His family again Israel. There is no teaching of a universal Fatherhood here. The elder son represents the pious observers of the law; and the younger the publicans, who have hired themselves out to the

heathen because they are broken men, and see no other way to live. God, the Father of Israel, does not wish to lose one of His children; and least of all when His Kingdom is coming for them.

So far, then, we are in no doubt. But we feel, and Our Lord's hearers may well have felt, that many questions about the Kingdom are pressing for an answer. How is this Kingdom coming, and where will it be? What of the Messiah, of whom the Lord seems to say nothing, and of all that has been expected from Him? The Roman power seems established more firmly than ever; there is the head of Tiberius upon the tribute money; who, if not the Messiah, is to sweep this power away? The hopes of the prophets had exhibited much variety; they were not all easily reconcilable one with another. Were all their hopes to be fulfilled, or some only? Now it is widely held that there were two different conceptions of the Kingdom; and corresponding with them, two different conceptions of the Messiah; and though in simple minds they may not have been clearly distinguished, it may help our thoughts if we consider them separately.

The first conception of the Kingdom of God was that of a restored Israel. "After these things I will return," so St. James of Jerusalem quotes the ancient prophecy, "and I will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom My Name is called, saith the Lord, who maketh these things known from the beginning of the world" (Amos ix. 11, 12). Israel was fallen and ruinous, but it could be raised again. There was a faithful "remnant," a "rock," upon which rebuilding was possible; and upon this rock God would once more build His Church. The sin of Israel would be taken away; those who had been faithful would be vindicated by the overthrow of their oppressors; and, as "the residue of men" saw Israel's prosperity, they too would be attracted to Israel's God.* Though spiritual blessings were not forgotten, earthly blessings were more prominent.

Now to this conception of the Kingdom there corresponded the conception of the Messiah as a Prince of David's line. The reign of David was the golden age of the past, and the golden age of the future would correspond to it. We may find the foundation of this conception of the Messiah in the promise to David that His dynasty should never fail; and even in the darkest days of the rule of the oppressor the Jews could look forward to the restoration of David's throne in one of his

* Isa. xix. 24, *cf.* lvi. 6, 7; Zech. xiv. 16.

descendants. "And it shall come to pass on that day . . . that I will break his yoke from off thy neck . . . and strangers shall no more serve themselves of him: but they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them"* (Jer. xxx. 8, 9). By this Messiah the enemies of Israel were to be overthrown, and its independence restored, while the Messiah Himself was to be the ideal king of the seventy-second psalm, the protector of the poor and needy, "with dominion also from sea to sea, and from the River unto the ends of the earth" (*cf.* Isa. xi. 1-5). It is true that after the Exile the Messianic expectation had been overclouded; the great Maccabean rulers had been of the tribe of Levi. But when they passed away the old expectations burst into flame once more. Read the seventeenth of the Psalms of Solomon, a book of Pharisaic Psalms written about fifty years before Our Lord's birth; or consider the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus*. When in the Gospel story the people salute Our Lord as the Son of David, it is this form of the Messianic hope that is in their minds. Could Our Lord accept these conceptions for His Gospel? In part, yes. The Catholic Church is the restored Israel of which Amos and the Lord spoke, sent just as Israel was to attract the world to God by the glory and beauty of its corporate life; and the Lord is there already reigning over the house of David, in so far as our unbelief and sin allow. But in part, no. The glory of the Church is no material glory; it bears the Cross after Christ; and the Christ Himself is no blood-stained warrior, trampling the Gentiles in His fury. Do we wonder if at first He shrank from claiming to be the Messiah? The Messiah He was, but the thought of the Messiah needed purging before He could use it. Apparently He had no liking for the title Son of David. He only mentions that title once, and then only to propound a difficulty which it suggests (Matt. xxii. 43-45).

But then there was another conception of the Kingdom of God, and perhaps we may say another conception of the Messiah corresponding to it. Not infrequently in late prophecies of the Old Testament, and in apocalyptic books not contained in our Bible, we find a conception of a more startling kind. Israel has now had to do with the great empires; its whole outlook upon the world has been widened; and the Divine salvation which once seemed sufficient no longer seems so. It is felt that the whole world needs some great change to pass over it, if the rule of God is to be a reality. "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former things shall not be remembered, nor come into mind." The world, as we know it,

* *Cf.* Isa. ix. 6, 7; Ez. xxxiv. 23; xxxvii. 24, 25.

is not the world that God meant it to be; it has been cursed for man's sake; and if it is to be a suitable home for redeemed man, it must itself be redeemed. Moreover, how about the faithful dead? Surely the Kingdom will embrace not only the living but the departed too. It cannot be that those who have in fact lived and died, "not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar," will be deprived of the reward for which the people of God are waiting. So there is a new conception of the Kingdom, and some of the most beautiful words of the Old Testament belong to it. "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad; and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. . . . Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing. . . . Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth the dead" (Isa. xxxv. 1, 5; xxvi. 19). "He hath swallowed up death for ever; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the reproach of His people shall He take away from off all the earth" (Isa. xxv. 8). We have travelled far from a new Davidic monarchy, and we hear little of the Messiah now. If any Messiah there is to be, He must be very much more than a Prince of David's line. "I saw in the night visions, and behold there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before Him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (Dan. vii. 13, 14). Is this son of man the Messiah that is now needed, or is he but a personification of God's people Israel? We need not stay to discuss this question. It was in the former way, it would seem, that some at any rate interpreted the words. We find this heavenly Son of Man in the Similitudes of the Book of Enoch, that strange book with which more than one of the writers of the New Testament seems to be familiar; and there he is a very exalted figure indeed. He seems to be a pre-existent Being; universal dominion is his, and all judgment is committed to him. Could the Lord accept these conceptions for His Gospel? Again, yes and no. These conceptions, like the others, had much in them that was true and noble. God had indeed provided better things for His people than this world can offer them; and the dead will not be forgotten when the kingdom comes. But there was much that was fantastic

and unworthy of God in these conceptions as the Jews held them. I do not think that Our Lord in His preaching to the multitude claimed to be the Son of Man of the Book of Enoch any more than He claimed to be the Messiah of the Old Testament.

We have left for the moment the Lord's Gospel, but we must now return to it. Which of these conceptions of the Kingdom was nearest to the Lord's mind? It is hard to say: but perhaps those who lay stress upon our Lord's apocalyptic outlook, His belief in a far-reaching change to pass over the world, are nearest to the truth. It is possible that some of the apocalyptic language ascribed to Him is not really His; St. Matthew's Gospel gives a prominence to it which the other Gospels do not; but we cannot suppose that it was absent from Our Lord's teaching. Read the later part of the seventeenth chapter of St. Luke's Gospel; the meaning is perfectly clear; and the outlook of the Apostolic Church could not have been as apocalyptic as it was if it had had no justification in Our Lord's teaching. Moreover, Our Lord's moral teaching looks in the same direction. Though it is not a mere "Ethic of the Interim," a moral teaching simply telling men how to live in the immediate prospect of the end of all things, the thought of a great change impending certainly colours it, as it has coloured all Christian teaching from that time to this; and it is hardly possible to maintain that Our Lord had nothing in view but the impending fall of the Jewish state. But it is surely clear that Our Lord did not think of the Kingdom of God as only to come when the present world has passed away. Was not the Kingdom of God already embodied in the Lord Himself? Here was One whose every thought, word, and deed was obedient to the Father's will. There is not a command which He gives, except those which presuppose previous wrongdoing, not a principle which He lays down, which is not perfectly embodied in His own example. And what was the meaning of the wonderful works which the Lord did? If they were not themselves blessings of the Divine rule, the first drops of the coming torrent of blessing, what were they? How does the Lord Himself speak? "If I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you" (Matt. xii. 28). Nor do these words stand alone. "The law and the prophets were until John. From that time the Gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it" (Luke xvi. 16). "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo! the kingdom of God is in the midst of you" (Luke xvii. 21). The Kingdom of God is already beginning in Our

Lord Himself, and in those who attach themselves to Him. Though one day it will come suddenly as the lightning in its full glory, yet it is even now present. It is like a mustard seed, a tiny thing as yet, but destined to grow into a sheltering tree. It is like leaven, gradually transforming all that welcomes it. In the Lord and His followers the wedding-feast of the Kingdom is already beginning: and, if they can be members of the Kingdom, so can others, so can the whole nation. That is what the Lord desires. So the Lord calls men to faith; to faith in His message of the good time coming, and of the good time already come; to faith in Himself as the Herald of the Kingdom; and so to repentance and attachment to Him. It was not the full Gospel yet; it could not be that before the Lord's redeeming work was done. But it was what was needed at the moment; and if men accepted and lived by it, the Kingdom, whatever it might prove to be, would one day be theirs.

H. L. Goudge.

THE CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH*

It is possible to call attention to various differences and distinctions among those who would claim a rightful possession of the Christian Name, involving dissimilar and even sharply contrasted understandings of what Christianity means; but I do not know that, apart from fundamental cleavages in Christology, any one cuts deeper or leads to more comprehensive results than that which divides those for whom the problem of Christianity is one and the problem of the Church another, and those who, at this point, reject any such dualism. The latter view the Church as an inherent element in the Christian religion, giving to that religion a particular form and power of self-expression which is observable in all sorts of ways and details, as well as in its general ethical tone and intellectual coherence. To the others the Church is accidental rather than essential, a help which might become a hindrance, a convenience which might degenerate into a futility, an outpost of faith which should be surrendered, without sense of ultimate loss, did the well-being of the inner citadel of faith require it. For them Christianity is something altogether greater and more necessary than the Church; to be a Christian is the important thing; as to the Church they are never very far off the attitude of "What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba?"

* A paper read at the 1925 Conference of the Anglican Fellowship.

A moment's reflection will show that the result of any such attitude upon the conception of the Church must be almost entirely negative. The Church is lost in what are spoken of as the Churches, and the approach to them is empiric and utilitarian, and judgment is passed upon them according as they do or do not seem to serve the interests of the spiritual life. A theology of the Church does not exist where such standards rule, for a theology of the Church lifts the level of apprehension from purely human valuations to one in which man tries to see the Church as God sees it, and to realize the place which it holds in the divine counsels and purposes. But those for whom a Churchless Christianity involves no overwhelming obstacle or paradox are likely to judge simply by the apparent virtues and faults of this or that institution to which the name of Church in their experience belongs. They may indeed extend their gaze and interest, and include other similar institutions in their approval or criticism, but at the end of the whole process there is not the least probability that they will be any nearer a conception of the Church. The essential meaning of the Church must be given at the start, as a premiss. I do not say that observation of the Church's history and work may not lead to a judgment of value, which is a judgment of faith, that an essential meaning must exist, but no amount of searching investigation will, by itself, discover the secret. And for a quite adequate and sufficient reason. The Church is—or, if anyone prefers to speak thus, and here, indeed, it is more accurate—the Churches are institutions or societies existing within the natural world of phenomena. That they are also something more than that would, of course, be granted by anyone who had any belief in God's real government of the natural order and in the function, relating to His purposes, of sets of facts occupying distinctive positions within that order. But to go further and deeper than that, to look into the heart of the life and being of the Churches, and to interpret them, to value them aright in terms of the one true supernatural conception of the Church—it is unreasonable to expect anyone to be able to do that unless he brings with him what he has to find. And there are so many who bring nothing like that with them. Christianity has carried with it no idea of the Church, enabling them to view the whole fabric of what is called institutional Christianity as no casual element determined by the necessity for self-preservation and self-adaptation to the world, but the embodiment of the truth that at every salient point in Christianity God's revelation is antecedent to man's discovery.

For the first and fundamental truth about the Church is that it is a supernatural reality which exists for God before it exists

for man. The Church is not an example within the religious sphere of the working of the gregarious instinct, but the holy and redeemed society and fellowship which could never have come into existence had not God willed that through it His purposes of salvation should be both made known and mediated. The New Testament allows of no lesser view than this. There may be forms of ecclesiasticism which obscure the majesty of the Church as it is presented to our view, not as a formal scheme, but partly as vision, prophecy and ideal, partly as an already present and effective reality, in the New Testament literature. But I would dare to say that no ecclesiasticism can be so utterly wide of the mark as any supposition that it is a matter of individual option whether the Church be or be not reverenced as the home within which God dispenses the peculiar gifts of His lovingkindness and builds up the life of the faithful. To stop short at Christ's Divinity or at the Holy Spirit as the indwelling power of the individual Christian, and to make of the Church not an article of faith but a matter of personal preference, is to be as arbitrary in the interpretation of the dogmatic side of the New Testament as some of the literary and historical critics are in the selections which they make within their special provinces.

I wish to explore the causes of the error, as I conceive it, which I am criticizing, a little more extensively. Why is it that with the New Testament in their hands such a number of good and sincere Christians fail to take seriously what is taken so seriously in the books which give us the mind of Apostles and apostolic men ? Why is there often such impatience with any emphasis laid upon the Church, and the constant implication that while religion is something which really matters, the Church is of quite secondary concern, that the promotion of the cause of the Kingdom of God is an urgent necessity, but that to try to interest people, especially young people, in the Church is neither a needful nor likely to be a profitable endeavour ?

Well, in the first place, we have to take account of that bane of so much of present-day religion, even of Christian religion, the attempt to have it without paying the price which religion involves—that is, theology. There is a great deal of theology inherent in the conception of the Church as the Body of Christ, and His cherished Bride, as the special sphere of the work of the Holy Spirit, as the covenant-people of God, as the pillar and ground of the truth. Not one of these Biblical notions can be duly handled without consequences being manifested that render all facile discounting of the Church's position and claims impossible. It is natural that people who fight shy of theology should turn their attention, not so much deliberately as in instinctive avoidance of perilous commitments, from these great

testimonies and devote themselves to the much easier task of criticizing some particular manifestation of the undoubted fact that the Church is not yet without spot or wrinkle or any such thing. And that brings me to another point. The distinction between the ideal and the actual is inevitable in the case of the Church militant. There is a real problem in reconciling the high prerogatives of the Church, which we find proclaimed in the New Testament and grasp by faith and all that speaks of the presence of human infirmity. And though the theology of the invisible Church as it has been at times set forth shares the disadvantages which, as I have said, all theology has to contend with, something like that theology is probably the best way out of the dilemma which a number of people can find. That is, they transfer to a purely ideal and, one must add, non-existent Church all that bespeaks the Church's glory, while the institutions which claim the name of Church appear to them to possess no organic relationship to, much less to be an embodiment of, that ideal. So between the New Testament as supplying the vision of what the Church means to God and the concrete actuality of history an unbridgeable gulf appears to be set, and the Church which belongs to the latter becomes just one particular institution existing, indeed, for purposes which are more intimately concerned with God's design for the world and man than are other societies and institutions, but not essentially more divine than they.

I am sure we ought to have a great deal of sympathy with this perplexity. After all, it is because there has often been such an obscuring of the divine character of the Church through the evil which has found its way into the Church, evil which in this world is always possible where the divine can come to expression and illumination only through the human, that many have been caused to stumble. The new Israel of God is no more faultless than was the old Israel. Nor is it unnatural that at times the Kingdom of God and the Church should appear to be in contrast rather than in co-ordination or as mutually involved. This-worldly goodness is real goodness, and the Church has not always appeared to realize its character and its need to penetrate into every corner of life. The inspiration to seek social and national well-being, the incentive to work for a present world-order in which the ultimate values of well-being may find as real a home as is possible under the conditions of life in this world, have not, throughout the Church's history, been so clearly discoverable within the Church that there has been no need to look elsewhere for them.

And then, thirdly, the shattered unity of Christendom, harmful as it is in so many ways, is not least harmful in this,

that it has invaded the region of ideal conceptions, and suggested that all ideas of the Church must be tentative and provisional, and that so long as there is disunion we have nothing to offer but unauthoritative speculations. And it is difficult to avoid that when, instead of thinking in terms of the Church, the tendency is to think in terms of Churches and denominations. Again, I would say that thought and talk of that kind is disastrous. Churches do not exist. The New Testament use of the plural has a wholly different connotation. There is only one Church, just as there is only one God. But as things are, there is no way of making that plain except by talking theology, and that, as we have seen, to many people is an irrelevance.

Now, if in this situation one wants to be of use and to help people to see in the Church an indispensable element in Christianity and in their own religious lives, we shall not achieve our ends by the formal methods and distinctions of the textbooks, or even by emphasizing the familiar notes of the Church as they appear in the Creed. Or rather, in entire loyalty to the truths contained in the historic adjectives One Holy Catholic Apostolic, we must show that here we are fortifying ourselves not by the sanctions of tradition, but by a stress upon principles which could be dispensed with only if we were prepared to sacrifice the whole idea of a definite substance and form in connection with Christianity.

Whatever we say will be of the nature of a challenge, but it may also be of the nature of an appeal. Let us put the challenge in the strongest way, and insist that no conception of the Church will serve which comes short of the conviction that the Church is the supreme means, sacrament, and reality of religious fellowship between man and God and man and man, that as it is not within man's right or power to say whether he shall seek and attain to communion with God through Christ, so it is not for him to contract out of the Church where his spiritual life is concerned. The old saying, *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*, does not give a possibility of decision as to individual destiny, but it expresses the truth that God's will, so far as it is revealed to us, is to save men within, as members of, a redeemed community. That is the challenge, but it is also the appeal. It is the appeal to the instinct for unity at its highest, so that men who have learnt, though they have much more to learn, something of the truth that fellowship is an indispensable requisite of good life in this world, may lift up their eyes and see that God has provided such a fellowship for them in all that appertains to the good life which is eternal. I cannot adopt Mr. Clutton Brock's interpretation of the Christian message as teaching that no one can be saved unless all be saved, but most emphatically would I

claim for Christianity the vision of the richness of a corporate salvation in which the individual gains at every point by the heritage into which he enters. Surrender the conception of the one fellowship, and the Christian insistence on unity in respect of God, the world and the religious relationship which binds the world to God is weakened. We know that in experience through the fact of the disunion of Christendom. It would be far worse if we deliberately abandoned the ideal conception.

But we cannot be content with the conception of unity by itself. We need to make clearer its grounding, its necessary commitments, and its end. Its grounding reaches back to the beginnings of Christianity. If the meaning of Christianity can be detached from the controlling ideas of that religion in the apostolic age, the reference to Pentecost and its results may be treated as comparatively unimportant; but if the Gospel which was preached on the basis of the death and resurrection of Jesus and of the coming of the Spirit is the one sure source of light and power, there is a permanent significance in the fact that along with its appeal to these basal facts and the growth of a theology interpreting their meaning, there went a growth of the Church's consciousness of its own value and place. A religion which was attentive only to the Jesus of the earthly ministry, not to the exalted Christ, and much less to His apostles and their discoveries about Him, might dispense almost wholly with the Church, though even so it would have to reduce the Twelve to the rank of mere disciples, whereas it seems as though Jesus intended them to be much more. But such a religion does not appear to me to possess any claim to reality. And anyone who reckons with the Apostles must reckon with the Church. But it is obviously impracticable to try to revive the Apostolic Church in the form which belonged to it at the beginning of the Church's mission. If one believes that the Church is not primarily a national institution, but that through all that disfigures its history there still shines the light which testifies to its divine character as the body of the Christ, the chosen means for the continued self-giving of God with a view to man's knowledge of Him, and to what St. Paul calls the obedience of faith, we shall not feel able to regard the history of the Church as though purely natural processes were at work in it. The difficulty of discrimination may often be great, but I do not see how we can avoid the attempt to see what is essential to the Church's life, without which no adequate conception of the Church would be possible. Certainly we step upon the most highly controversial ground at this point. Yet even here there may be agreement to this extent that the Church is bound to make the meaning of its life clear, and to express itself in such

ways as will show that the Church, like any secular institution, exists for definite purposes relative both to the well-being of its own members and to its power to attract those who are without. The concentration upon the bonds of internal unity in the Church, constituted by Creed, Ministry, and Sacraments, which has been familiar from the second century in connection with Christian dogmatics and apologetics and is really inherent in the New Testament, is not properly a formal convenience, but is a demonstration of the fact that the Church is an articulated body. The meaning, the resources, and the organization of the Church's life are given in these features of the Church which some find so puzzling and some so provocative. The Catholicity of the Church, whether regarded as something already existing or as an ideal, is so completely involved in them that a surrender of them would be equivalent to throwing into the melting-pot the whole idea of the Church as that has worked itself out in history, and to a start *de novo*. I do not believe that one can profitably argue about the possibility or feasibility of such procedure. It would be an act not of reason but of faith. I should say of faith unsupported by any rational considerations. The relegation of the Creed, the Sacraments, and the Ministry to the region of things indifferent is not evolution, but revolution. I do not believe that it is the logical outcome of the Reformation or that the smallest discernible hope for Christian Union or for the power of Christianity in the world lies along those lines.

But, it may be asked, granted that the Church as an essential element in Christianity must be interpreted in the light of its own history, so that the purely ideal and divine element can only be seen and is sometimes obscured by the incidence of particular historical circumstances; granted, further, that certain characteristics of the Church's life appear to possess a peculiar significance, and to be undetachable from that life—must there not be some closer correlation than has as yet been indicated of the purpose and end which the Church exists to promote in the case of its own members and of that which it suggests to the world as the truest development of the world's life, and, at the same time, a development only possible within the Church? To such a question we can answer, with the knowledge that at no time in Christian history would any substantially different answer have been given, that the moral ideal which the Church upholds and claims as inherent in its life is the moral ideal which alone will allow and enable the achievement by the world of a harmonious and stabilized ordering of its own life. The Church holds to no ethical ideal which is fitting only for its own members. Its ideal is a universal one. Only it has no belief that such an ideal can ever be made effective through the inspiration of a morality

which never looks beyond the present world. The highest goodness is the fruit not of natural effort, but of redeemed devotion. At this point we are brought face to face with the most disconcerting and yet the most hopeful paradox of Church history, and therefore of the Church's life. The greatest strain upon faith in the Church has been due to all that has marred, that has appeared almost to efface, the ethical witness and reality of the Church. It still is true that fewer things cause keen and ardent spirits to stumble, sometimes with least hope of recovery, than the moral commonplaceness and pedestrianism which appears to them to be a mark of the Church's life, and to put the Church almost in opposition to Christ. How much there is to be said for them! Nevertheless, it is just here that the signs of the divine life in the Church manifest themselves most brightly. There is no such rich variety of moral life to be found anywhere as in the Church, no such welding together of virtues which so often suffer from being developed in isolation. If the highest moral flights were unassayable in the Church, if its holiness were only an ideal standing over against it, it would be at best a prophet who found it impossible to practise what he preached. It is because of the heights which have been scaled within the Church that we know that its ethical challenge is not a dream proceeding from the gates of ivory, of no substance apprehensible within the waking life of men. And here I must interpolate one brief rejoinder to a criticism which may arise from those who look for another explanation of the facts, the criticism that the glory of such moral achievements belongs not to the Church, but to individual Christians. Such achievements are, of course, in one sense the glory of individuals. But they have grown out of the soil of the Church's life, they have been built upon the foundation of the Church's Creed and of habituation to its scale of values. It is not fair to put to the account of the Church the dishonour of its members' faults and deny it credit for their virtues.

If there is truth in what I have tried to say, I do not think that the divisions of the Church seriously affect it. All that the divisions of the Church suggest to an English Churchman is that the unity of the Church does not involve empirically unbroken oneness. What we should think of the different Christian groups is another matter. That in all of them equally the idea of the Church is preserved does not seem to me very credible. But I doubt if any one theory is thoroughly satisfactory. Once when I was a boy I heard Canon J. G. Simpson, who was then Principal of Leeds Clergy School, say in a sermon that the Church was infallible to God but not to man. A High Church uncle of mine, with a very orthodox and matter-of-fact mind, remarked

to me that the statement would be truer put the other way round. But I am not sure that the deeper truth did not lie with Canon Simpson. I cannot accept the view that the Church is essentially fallible at any point which concerns the essence of its life and Gospel. Nevertheless, I do not see my way to any statement as to the method of working of the Church's infallibility which would allow of an immediate test. All I am sure of is that to the end the Church will live on as the elect trustee and embodiment of the divine life in the world. The redeemed fellowship will be the Christian way in the future as in the past. The Spirit ever bloweth where He listeth, but the sanctuary of the Spirit is the Body of Christ.

J. K. Mozley.

THE FUNCTION AND FUTURE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND *

To treat this subject adequately would need both a historian and a prophet, and I am neither. I ask myself, Is there anything that I can say which will be more than a platitude? Yet I feel my subject to be one of immense importance, and that chiefly for two reasons.

1. Because there are very many at present, and specially amongst the rising generation, who, whilst interested and even anxious about religion, neither care about the Church nor see its importance, or even its connection with religion.

2. The Church of England, as we are at last learning to see, must be, because of the position of England in the world, primarily a missionary Church, and present conditions in India, Africa, the Far East, and the Moslem world constitute a call of immense urgency upon all Christians. Less than ever can we consider our Church only as regards its position and function in England; we must think of it in its connection with the whole world.

The consideration of our subject is made difficult by the loose way in which such important terms as "church," "unity," "comprehension" are used. I do not intend to attempt a definition of these great words. All I should like to say at the outset is that when I speak of the Church, I do not necessarily or primarily mean the Church of England; when I speak of unity, I do not mean uniformity; when I speak of comprehensiveness, I do not mean latitudinarianism or compromise.

* A paper read at the 1925 Conference of the Anglican Fellowship.

We cannot rightly consider the function of the Church of England unless we keep constantly in the background the great vision of the universal Church, the Church to which all those who follow Christ belong. We cannot see that Church as an organized whole, we cannot see how it can be realized, but we must believe that it exists in the mind of God; and that, as we in our individual selves, and in the fellowship of our different Churches seek the truth in love, He will reveal to us in what way we can reach that unity which is His purpose for His Church. We believe, as the report of the Lambeth Conference says, "that the unity which we seek exists," but to try to create it in haste, by our own methods, may only lead to further division, as has been lately shown in Canada in the attempted union between Presbyterians and Methodists, which has already created a new schism. Premature attempts to create an organic unity will only lead to reaction. F. D. Maurice wrote long ago that "every modern attempt to construct a universal society had been defeated by the determination of men to assert their own wills." In discussions about reunion do we not often find the underlying idea, expressed or unexpressed, that it can only come by everyone joining the speaker's particular communion? Yet, whilst repudiating any idea that everyone should be expected to join the Church of England, we are justified in believing that our Church has its own special contribution to make to the great Church of the future. It is imperative, therefore, that we should try to see what that special contribution may be.

As we study the history of our Church, we see it pass through one troublous period after another, when new life, new ideas were stirring, producing inevitable conflict and reaction, these times of life and conflict being succeeded by times of stagnation and indifference. The time through which we are passing now seems to combine all these characteristics. But through all, through uncertainty and confusion, in the past something has always survived, and somehow the Church which we love and in which we ought to glory has taken shape. From the first it aimed at comprehension, at drawing together the Catholic and Evangelical traditions of Christendom. I do not think that its members have always, if ever, realized the full meaning and implications of comprehension. The Tudor mind could not do without uniformity, so they attempted to combine comprehension with uniformity. There may have been a time when uniformity was needed, and no community can exist without some limitations to possible variations. Archbishop Temple said in 1898: "It is the unity of the ceremonial that makes the toleration of diversity of opinion possible." What

did he exactly mean by unity of ceremonial? The Bishop of Gloucester, in a sermon preached a couple of weeks ago said: "It has become clear that there may be very considerable variation in all things which concern ceremonial and outward custom, within the same religious body," and also that "as soon as this desire for uniformity begins to prevail, the ultimate result is inevitably Christian division." I hope we are learning to give up the desire for uniformity, and we have fortunately learned to see that permissible variations may exist without destroying true unity. Is it not possible that our Church may help to show how within the great Church of the future there will be room for every communion, for every nation, to express what the Holy Spirit has revealed to it of God's will?

But the trouble is that we have not yet learned for ourselves what comprehension means, and that our divisions within the Church of England are a scandal to the world outside, and prevent us from doing the work to which Christ calls us. People are inclined to think of comprehension as something indeterminate, vague, washy. If it were this, it could not be the characteristic of a really living Church. The desire for it does not proceed from any idea that one thing is as good as another, but from the conviction that the truth is too big for any individual or any group to grasp. There must be differences, and no evil will result from them so long as all are sincerely attached to the doctrine and fellowship of the Church. Of course, if the Church is to have a real existence there can be no difference as to its fundamental doctrine, though so long as language is imperfect and thought confused, there will be differences as to the ways in which that doctrine is expressed and interpreted. At the Reformation the Church of England made no breach with continuity or tradition; it did not set out to determine the Faith or to change the Creeds or early organization of the Church, but it set itself to disentangle by the help of sound learning and spiritual insight "what was primitive and Catholic from later accretions."

This is a process which must always go on. All later accretions or developments need not be evil; many of them may help to a fuller expression of spiritual truths, or may help to express those truths to different minds. In judging them a sense of proportion is imperative, and they must be considered in an atmosphere of religious toleration and freedom by those who put first the search for truth. To such, toleration means that they hold the truth which they have apprehended to be so precious that they can understand how others value the truth which they have apprehended. We are very ready to assert that we are tolerant and that we respect the freedom of others;

we do not always think out all that tolerance implies. We believe that we have become tolerant and have given up persecution, yet we retain the persecuting spirit in us in so far as we want to make the Church just what suits us, and to keep out or drive out others. But our tolerance must not lead us to think that one thing is as good as another. Amiel gave a wise warning when he said that "the right of the individual to be free must not be confused with the necessity for the institution to be something."

If there is to be a visible Church at all, it must be built upon something. Its work is to set forth Christ as the truth, and it must maintain clearly the distinction between opinions about Him as one element in human knowledge and Himself as the all-comprehensive source of truth. This distinction shows the limits to comprehensiveness. The Church of England is a fellowship of those who seek to set forth to the English people the historical Christ as the truth, the revelation of God. It is the Church of a free people. The English people have taught the world something of what freedom is; we believe that we understand it better than any other people. May it not be our function to show the world what freedom means in a branch of the Catholic Church, and hence what freedom may be within the whole Church ? If we are to do this we must clear ourselves of all remnants of the persecuting spirit. We must learn to see that it is the want of love, of understanding, of sympathy, that makes our divisions "unhappy," instead of a real gain, seeing that in this imperfect life our conception as well as our expression of the truth must vary. Let us remember the men whom our Church has included in the past, Pusey, Stanley, F. W. Robertson, Keble, F. D. Maurice, not to go further back; the men it includes at present—Bishop Gore, Dean Inge, Canon Streeter, Dr. Darwell Stone, Bishop Knox, the aged Canon Wilson. Some of these may have tried, may be trying, to make the Church what it is not, yet they remain within it; they all contribute something to its richness, its learning, and respect for antiquity, to its sense of continuity, of freedom, of belief in development, to its recognition of the need for submission to authority, together with the use of reason and the sense of individual and social responsibility. We have to recognize what this comprehensiveness involves: true tolerance combined with the constant pursuit of truth, veneration, and teachableness in our attitude towards the past, yet fearlessness in our pursuit of the truth, courage in our maintenance of the truth as revealed to us, combined with respect for the opinions of others, and, above all, belief in the constant inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit.

I have put forward this exhibition of the true meaning of comprehensiveness, as one of the chief distinctions of the Church of England, important not only for her life and work in England but for the whole world. It is her glorious fortune to be a link, if she will, between other communions and to strive not only for herself but for the whole Catholic Church to keep the balance between what is fundamental and what is only of local or temporary importance. There is much else to be considered in the function of the Church of England as regards the English people.

There are those who object to her position both as a national and as an established Church. I do not purpose to argue the question of the meaning of establishment. In so far as it can be interpreted to mean that the Church should be regarded as a department of the State it is opposed to the true nature of a spiritual Church. The Church herself would lose little if anything by disestablishment—that is, if by it she became quite independent of the State. It must, however, be remembered that that is impossible unless she absolutely ceases to hold any property. It is the State that would lose by disestablishment. The Church of England now is the Church of the whole English people. There are many who think it would be more powerful if it was really a fellowship of those only who fully accepted its teaching and conformed to its discipline. This no doubt would give it a special strength and would bring comfort and help to its members by a closer and perhaps more perfect visible unity. But such a conception is opposed to the genius of our Church, which, as the Church of the English people, has responsibility towards every individual in the land. People smiled at the way in which the Tommies, who had no religious views of their own, put themselves down as C. of E. In truth, this showed a true conception of the Church which recognizes no one as being an outsider; she has duties to all and is bound to make provision for the spiritual needs of all; but she accepts the position of a free Church for a free people, as such she works by influence, not by power. She must not attempt to impose her views or precepts, however wise they may be; she must exercise her influence by persuasion and good works. She must remember that she is the witness to the truth as revealed in Jesus Christ, the guardian of all the good that exists in society. It is her business to train the national character, to fit it both for responsibility and freedom. To do this a clear perception of essentials is needed; the Catholic faith must be taught, but with simplicity and a sense of proportion. The importance of different parts of the truth tends to be emphasized, sometimes unduly, at different times; the Church must try to

absorb them all, and to reduce them to their proper proportions whilst being receptive of new impulses, and afraid of nothing. Much has been lost in the past by fear, especially by the fear of enthusiasm natural to most Englishmen; growth and development are terrifying to our natural conservatism. Let us find comfort when tempted to be fearful by remembering that wild ideas have a tendency to work their own destruction, opposition may only strengthen them, and error can best be met by a more faithful exhibition of the truth. Controversy will never bring light; that can only come through the common search for truth in love. It is of the essence of the Church of England to maintain the balance between tradition and individual judgment. The trouble is that this characteristic does not produce enthusiasm, whilst the zeal of partisans attracts many even if it repels some. We should learn to feel the enthusiasm of those who have before them a bigger ideal than any partisan can have. Augustine wrote of the rival views of his day: "All these, Catholic unity embraces in her motherly breast, bearing each other's burdens in turn, and endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace until the Lord should reveal to one or the other of them if in any point they think otherwise than as they should." So long as our Church is torn by inward disputes and controversies, she must be so discredited in the outer world that she cannot hope to fulfil her great and noble task as peacemaker.

People are always calling upon the Church to take sides, to make protests to determine disputes. That is not her work. Nothing that concerns the life of the English people can be alien to her, but it is not her part to judge or decide either in political or industrial questions. What she should do, not only through her leaders, for here even the humblest members can help, is to influence the temper in which industrial and political disputes are carried on, and this can only be done by avoiding anything like partisanship, by calling attention to the principles in accordance with which such disputes should be settled, and to the spirit of fellowship and service in which alone a solution can be found. Much can be done by bringing men together, as has been shown in the past on some notable occasions. But the Church must exhibit and teach fellowship at all times, and especially in the direction of her own affairs, if she is to be powerful as a peacemaker in times of crisis both national and international. She must in all things, social, industrial, and political, teach the right attitude to life.

We see clearly in how many ways our economic, our political life is not Christian. We have heard how it impresses both Christian converts in their early fervour and non-Christians

who visit us from the East. The Church cannot tell the manufacturer or the merchant or those they employ how in detail their business should be conducted, but she can stir them up to a constant discontent with existing conditions, to a constant effort to produce a healthy and vigorous common life. It is needless to dwell on the ways in which she has failed in doing this in the past, in which she has allowed herself to be not unfairly considered as the Church of the well-to-do, of the Conservative party, of the capitalist. The shame with which we read of the indifference of the Church to great evils in the past, such as slavery and the conditions of industry, should make us very sensitive to the possibility of similar neglect and mistakes in the present. We are called upon not to say peace where there is no peace, but to be the Lord's remembrancers, to take no rest, to give Him no rest until He make Jerusalem a praise upon earth.

In all this the Church of England as such has, of course, no function different from that of any other branch of the Catholic Church, but as a national Church she has a special responsibility for the life and religion of the nation as a whole. It is interesting to notice the different ways in which she is recognized as the National Church. Those who do not attend her services yet speak as if it were a personal injury when proposals for Prayer Book revision are brought forward; they seem to value the Prayer Book as an institution which must not be changed. They may do nothing for the Church, but they still think she belongs to them. The Prayer Book is the standard of worship for her members, and an exhibition of the nature of her teaching . As a National Church she is bound to seek to determine the best methods of setting forth to the English people with their own particular characteristics, their own special place in the world, the contents and the application of the Christian Faith. Our imperial position makes our Church first and foremost a missionary Church, whilst through her relationship with the sister Churches of the Dominion and of the United States, a special call comes to the Church of England to maintain that balance between tradition, between the authority of the Bible and the right and responsibility of private judgment, between the claim to freedom, and the recognition of its limitations which is characteristic of her. We have points of contact with all parts of the Catholic Church. I dare not claim that we are worthy to be the peacemaker between them, but surely, if we are worthy of our great inheritance, we may be amongst the peacemakers.

And so I am brought to the last part of my subject, the future of the Church of England.

For its future vigour and growth I believe that its position as the Church of a free people calls upon it especially to realize the part that the laity, both men and women, should play in its life and work. This has to a certain extent been recognized by the creation of the House of Laity in the Church Assembly, but this mere fact from time to time brings more clearly to light the often dumb, sometimes noisy, opposition there is between clergy and laity, and the claims made by both as regards their rights and position. We must think out more clearly what are the implications of this return of our Church to primitive conditions. We believe that equally with the clergy the laity are members of the Church and have their share in its work and responsibilities; there is difference of function rather than difference of position. I might go on to discuss the ministry of women. I will abstain, only insisting that they at least belong to the laity and have their rights and responsibilities.

The great question for the future of the Church of England is whether it will be able to hold together the different elements of which it is composed and which I venture to think add to the fulness of its life. For this the first great essential is to go on without fear. The excesses of one extreme section or another force themselves upon the notice of those who value the Church as well as of those who are indifferent or inclined to believe that it is no longer of any real account. Extremists are always noisy. They affirm or protest; but experience shows us that in the midst of the clash of contest the truth is preserved. Fear will lead to the desire to exclude, and so cause a new breach in unity. Let us leave it to those who are dissatisfied with the Church to go out themselves, and let us not in acts or words, or even in thought, have any desire to drive them out. Let us abstain from the favourite game of heresy-hunting. Our concern must be for the life of the Church. Restatement may be needed, a new sense of proportion in the way religious truth is taught to the young, so that they may see more clearly its connection with the whole of life. In everything we need to keep before us a vision of what the Church might be in the life of the nation, of what our nation might do for the world if it were really Christian. May I in conclusion quote some words in which that vision was set forth twenty-six years ago:

> I see in it a Church, not existing in indefinite space, and founding claims to universality on the ground that it has no particular home, but a Church rooted in the minds and hearts of the English people. . . . From that home it can go forth courageously and face the world as it is, believing that God's revelation of Himself once made in the person of Jesus Christ is being continually explained to men by that progressive

revelation of God's purpose which is continually being made by the divine government of the world. . . . A Church fitted for free men training them in knowledge and reverence alike . . . finding room increasingly for every form of devotional life, but training its graces into close connection with men's endeavours and aspirations . . . afraid of nothing, receptive of new impulses, quick, watchful, alert; proving all things . . . exhorting, persuading, convincing; so rooted in the past that it is strong in the present, and evermore hopeful of the future. . . . Its eyes turned to the past for instruction and warning, not for imitation. Steadfast in the faith, built up on the foundation which its Master laid, it can speak the truth in love, using such words and methods as men can best understand, so penetrated by the importance of its message that it can speak it in manifold ways to men of varying tempers and knowledge and feelings. . . . Our difficulties and differences arise because we have not a sufficiently lofty conception of the destiny of the English Church. If any disaster befalls it, the record that will be written hereafter will be that English Churchmen of this our day were not sufficiently large-hearted and high-minded to recognize the greatness of the heritage which was theirs.

This is a vision of what the English Church may be in the future for the English people. May we not dare to hope that if it preserves its great heritage of freedom, it may help to free the Church universal from some of the bonds and fetters which hinder it from making the living Christ the Lord of all life? I want to end by quoting some words from one who is still amongst us, and whose long experience and great and varied learning demand our attention when he speaks as a prophet. This is what Canon Wilson last year, at the age of eighty-eight, said to a gathering of theological students in Cambridge:

The real evangel will come, and is coming as I believe as unnoticeably as the dawn, from the sum of human moral consciousness and experience. The source will be none the less the work of the Holy Spirit, who is, and for ages has been, guiding men into truth. That conception of God towards which theology, science, philosophy, psychology are leading us, will take its own form, which narrow and suspicious Churchmen, as they have done in every age, will condemn as heretical; and then after a time the world will exclaim: "That explains Christ: that must have been His vision, for which there were then neither words nor audience ready; that was the thought His hearers very partially understood, very imperfectly reported." My outlook, though I feel now in my old age incapable of giving it proper expression, is of this kind: that through the presence in man of the Holy Spirit, a real evangel of God and of Christ is at hand behind, as it were, a slight and removable screen, and that it only needs a prophet to proclaim and discern it and all will see its truth. . . . The human race is evolving, and we as individuals are becoming more and more conscious that we are responsible agents with large freedom, as well as subjects in this evolution . . . we are now or may become conscious and free agents of the Creator. We share something of His vision, His freedom, His power, His will—something of Himself. We are His children. We are working with our Creator in the making of a new heaven and a new earth.

LOUISE CREIGHTON.

THE CONVERSION OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI*

The early life of Francis presents a difficult problem to the student of religion. All the world knows that during that period the young Bernardone developed into the Saint of Assisi, but it is no easy task to describe the nature of that development. Certainty as to the *fait accompli* is combined with doubt as to the process which led up to it. Some light may perhaps be thrown upon the problem by a brief discussion of the early religious experiences of Francis from the historical and the psychological points of view. For such a purpose we may assume the validity of the methods of historical criticism and psychological investigation, and may attempt to apply these methods to the data afforded by the experiences of the Saint. From this standpoint we shall seek to show that Francis' conversion was a gradual process; that it included the ordinary features of adolescent development; that these features were combined with the characteristics of mystical conversion; and, finally, that the locutions and visions which accompanied Francis' early struggles were of the interior or "imaginal" type.

I.

The view that Francis' conversion was a gradual process is based upon the historical evidence. In his case (even more than in that of Paul), we are faced with the peculiar uncertainties involved in attempts to gain an insight into the inner religious life of a historical character whose experiences have been very imperfectly recorded. In his own writings Francis does not give an account of any decisive experience of conversion, and the only references to his early struggles are to be found in his Will, where he states that after tending the lepers he "came out from this world," and claims that the Most High revealed to him that he must live "according to the rule of the Holy Gospel."† The absence of any full first-hand account compels us to rely upon the biographies of the Saint which deal with his early years. The only reliable authorities of this type are the two *Lives* by Thomas of Celano (1228 and 1246-47), supplemented by the *Legend of the Three Companions* (1246) and the definitive but conventional *Life* by Bonaventura (1260).‡

* Part of the Essay on "Conversion" recently awarded the Ellerton Prize in the University of Oxford.

† *The Writings of St. Francis of Assisi:* Newly Translated into English from the Original Texts according to the French Edition of F. Ubald D'Alençon, O.S.F.C. By Constance, Countess de la Warr. (London, no date.) Pp. 37 and 38.

‡ This summary is based on the position that has been reached mainly as a result of the criticism of the theories propounded by Sabatier. The critical basis on which

These records present this difficulty: they usually refer to Francis' conversion as a definite event, but they do not indicate unmistakably a single incident in Francis' early career which may be regarded as the moment of decisive change.

Those who regard Francis' conversion as a sudden moment of illumination usually identify this event with an experience which befell the Saint in St. Damian's Church. This view, which is adopted (though somewhat tentatively) by Sabatier is his *Life of St. Francis*,* has several arguments in its favour. In the first place, Francis' conversion is mentioned in the biographies as a definite event from which other incidents may be dated. Thus Celano† writes of Francis' work in repairing the Church at Portiuncula: "Now it was in the third year from his conversion when he had finished repairing the said Church" (1 Cel. 21); and opens his narrative of Francis' last days with the words: "The space of twenty years since his conversion was now accomplished" (1 Cel. 109). Similar references occur in all the authorities;‡ and all except 1 Cel. appear to identify this conversion with the incident in St. Damian's Church. 1 Cel. is not clear as to the spiritual crisis in St. Damian's, and simply mentions the repairing of the Church (1 Cel. 18). But Celano admits that his first *Life* was based on incomplete information (2 Cel. 2), and in the second *Life* he describes fully how in St. Damian's, Francis, "smitten by unwonted visitations," was directed by the Image of the Christ to repair the Church, and "felt that the change he had undergone was ineffable" (2 Cel. 10). More elaborate versions of this story occur in the works of the Three Companions (13) and Bonaventura (2 : 1), and the latter includes it in a chapter headed "Of his [Francis'] perfect conversion unto God." Among the moderns Sabatier regards this experience as marking "the final triumph of Francis"§ and the consummation of his union with Christ.

---

this position rests is set forth in A. G. Little, "The Sources of the History of St. Francis of Assisi" (*English Historical Review*, vol. xvii., p. 643), and *A Guide to Franciscan Studies* (London, 1920); Fr. P. Robinson, *A Short Introduction to Franciscan Literature* (New York, 1907), and "Francis of Assisi" (article in the Catholic Encyclopædia); Abbot E. C. Butler, "Francis of Assisi" (article in the Encyclopædia Britannica, 11th edition); A. G. Ferrers Howell, Introduction to the English Translation of Celano's *Lives of St. Francis of Assisi* (London, 1908).

* Paul Sabatier, *Life of St. Francis of Assisi*. English translation by L. S. Houghton (London, 1924).

† The references are given to the following English translations of the Latin texts (from which also the quotations are taken): 1 Cel. and 2 Cel., *The Lives of St. Francis of Assisi*, by Brother Thomas of Celano, translated by A. G. Ferrers Howell (London, 1908); 3 Soc., *The Legend of St. Francis*, by the Three Companions, now first translated into English, by E. G. Salter (London, 1905); Bon., *The Life of St. Francis*, by St. Bonaventura [translated by E. G. Salter] (London, 1904); Spec. Perf., *The Mirror of Perfection*, translated from the Cottonian MS. by Robert Steele (London, 1903).

‡ *Cf.* 1 Cel. 18; 2 Cel. 143; 3 Soc. 27; Bon. 14 : 3, etc.

§ *Op. cit.*, p. 56.

Finally, it is noted that immediately after this experience Francis sets about the repair of the Church with such zeal as to lead to his rupture with his family and his formal renunciation of his property. All the authorities except 1 Cel. make the quarrel and the renunciation follow upon the experience in the Church; and therefore regard the experience as the spiritual prelude to the decisive act.*

But it may be doubted whether these arguments can be accepted without question. While it is true that the biographers in certain contexts refer to the conversion as a definite event, it is equally true that elsewhere they speak of it as a gradual process. Thus Celano in his second *Life* refers to the Saint's scorn of money "even from the beginning of his conversion" (2 Cel. 65), and speaks of Francis' early life as a time "when this man began to cleave to God after casting away transitory things" (2 Cel. 159). Similar references are found in the other authorities (3 Soc. 68; Bon. 14 : 4, etc.), and their presence gives ground for the view that the biographers were not clear in their own minds as to whether the conversion was a sudden event or a gradual process. Hence their conception of the experience at St. Damian's as a definite conversion may be regarded as an attempt to read into the original material something which was not there from the first. Both Celano and Bonaventura were, as their writings show, steeped in the Scriptures, and they probably tended to read an experience of the Pauline or the Augustinian type into the records of their hero's early life. Sabatier's narrative has probably been influenced by a similar tendency. Further, it may be noted that the word *conversio* is the recognized term used in mediæval Latin to describe the change from the secular to the religious life;† and in our authorities it is so used to describe the act of entering into the Order —an act which included a renunciation of the world and an acceptance of the Rule.‡ Hence Francis' biographers, regarding his act of renunciation before the Bishop as a definite entry into the religious life, have been led to apply the word "conversion" to the experience with which the act was closely connected. And apart from the question of nomenclature, the evident prominence given to this incident, the most spectacular in Francis' early career, in the recollections of the Saint's companions, compels the biographers to assign a supremely decisive importance to the spiritual crisis which led to the act of renunciation. But it may be noted that Francis' early years are marked by other striking incidents, such as the kissing of the

* *Cf.* 2 Cel. 10-13; 3 Soc. 13-20; Bon. 2 : 1-6.

† Du Cange, *Glossarium Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis* (Niort, 1883). *Conversio*, tomus ii., p. 547. ‡ *Cf.* 1 Cel. 24, 25; 2 Cel. 20, 106; Bon. 2: 8; Spec. Perf., 18.

leper,* and the revelation of his vocation at Mass,† and it is indicated that each of these is preceded by a period of inward stress. Hence it may be argued that to select as *the* decisive experience the spiritual crisis which preceded one of these acts is to assign to it a position which is not justified by the evidence. It is more probable that the incident at St. Damian's and the activities to which it led were simply a stage in Francis' spiritual development; an important stage, it is true, but one not necessarily different in kind from the other crises through which he passed.

Hence it is suggested in opposition to the theory of sudden "conversion," that Francis' early struggles began with dissatisfaction with things as they were, and took the form of a series of spiritual crises each of which supplied enlightenment in a particular direction. Thus after being "full often admonished by visitations of the Holy Ghost" (2 Cel. 9), he nerves himself to kiss a leper; after being bidden in St. Damian's to repair the Church which was falling into ruin, he calls down his father's wrath by selling cloth to raise the necessary money;‡ and after being inspired by the words of the Gospel read at Mass (Mark vi., 7-13, etc.), he exclaims: "This is what I wish, this is what I am seeking" (1 Cel. 22), and, donning a rough tunic with a cord, sets out to preach repentance and peace. These crises are distinct, but are not different in kind; they are stages in the development of a spiritual personality towards the realization and adoption of its vocation. Hence Francis' conversion may be regarded as a gradual process of illumination spread over several years. It may fairly be taken as completed by the inspiration at Mass and the new mode of life which followed. It is not indicated, of course, that Francis' spiritual development ceased at that point; but the view is urged that from that time onwards Francis appears in the records as a religious personality sure of his vocation to a life of poverty, eager to deliver a definite message of repentance and peace, and ready to receive disciples. This position, it is contended, was arrived at after a gradual process of conversion.

II

It may reasonably be argued that this process extended over the period of adolescence, and that it included the ordinary features of adolescent development. The records of Francis' conversion, as we have already indicated, seem to show that it was a gradual process. The locution in St. Damian's Church,

* *Cf.* 2 Cel. 9; 3 Soc. 11; Bon. 1 : 4 and 5.
† *Cf.* 1 Cel. 22; 3 Soc. 25; Bon. 3 : 1.
‡ 1 Cel. 8-15; 2 Cel. 10-12; 3 Soc. 16; Bon. 2 : 1 and 2.

according to the accepted chronology, took place in 1206, when Francis was twenty-four, and his preaching, which followed the inspiration at Mass, started in 1209. The locution was preceded, as we have seen, by the crisis connected with the kissing of the leper, and that in its turn must have come at the end of a fairly long period of uneasiness and inward conflict. Hence it is not unreasonable to deduce that the religious and moral struggles which were the first stage in Francis' conversion began, at the latest, when he was in his nineteenth or twentieth year, and were finally brought to an end by the inspiration at Mass when he was twenty-seven. So far, therefore, as the chronology is concerned, Francis' conversion may have covered the adolescent stage in the life of a personality who developed comparatively slowly. Nor is there any reason to believe that this gradual but definite conversion was preceded by an earlier conversion in childhood or youth. Certain mystics have undergone an early conversion transient in its effect, and followed by a period of indifference or hostility to religion, which in its turn gives place to the mystical conversion proper. But in the case of Francis there is no mention in the records of such an early conversion and its repudiation, and there is no evidence that before the locution which preceded his kissing of the leper Francis was touched by strong religious emotion. His charity to the poor may well have been due simply to his natural kindliness. It may be noted, moreover, that his religious environment, that everyday religion of mediæval Italy, in which institutional, mystical, and superstitious elements were blended, was not such as to induce a childish experience of violent conversion. And the whole trend of the records goes to show that his development was a continuous process, which neither began nor ended with his gradual conversion during his adolescent period.

In this conversion several of the traits of the normal adolescent development may be distinguished. For example, he experienced the change of values which is an essential feature of the passage from childhood to manhood. The adolescent, if he is to develop an independent personality of his own, must pass through a stage of criticism and reaction from the standards which dominate his early environment. Francis showed his dissatisfaction with the standards of his *bourgeois* surroundings. He set out for Apulia to seek the military glory which would win for him a place among the nobility,* and he exchanged clothes with a beggar outside St. Peter's at Rome.† But the adolescent criticizes religious no less than social standards. In the light of his own experience and of his own growing indi-

* 1 Cel. 4-6; 2 Cel. 6; 3 Soc. 5 and 6; Bon. 1 : 3.
† 2 Cel. 8; 3 Soc. 10; Bon. 1 : 6.

viduality he reviews the religion which he has accepted on the authority of his parents, and, if he does not reject it in favour of some other form of religion or system of belief, he re-accepts it as confirmed and verified by his own experience. Francis must have learned his early faith from his pious mother (2 Cel. 3; 3 Soc. 2), and it was this traditional religion that became a living force for him in the process of his conversion. In like manner the records indicate stages in the development of his moral self-hood. In later life he was not free from temptations of the flesh (2 Cel. 116 and 117), and while there is no adequate evidence that he ever yielded to them, there is no reason to doubt that in his youth he passed through the usual period of moral awakening and struggle which comes with puberty. Nor was he unresponsive to a purely moral appeal during his early struggles, for when the Bishop declared " that he might not spend anything ill-gotten on sacred purposes " (2 Cel. 12), he gave back to his father the money, gained by the sale of cloth at Foligno, which he had intended to devote to the repair of St. Damian's Church. But the pursuit of a moral ideal in adolescence is almost always bound up with the desire to find an object to which the affective elements in the personality may be directed. The stabilization of the personality by the direction of the system of emotional dispositions to an object in which it finds satisfaction is, in many cases, perhaps the most prominent feature of adolescent conversion. Here, again, Francis conforms to type. Before his conversion and in its early stages he appears as a youth who has failed to find satisfaction in the various objects on which he lavished his emotions. He became dissatisfied with the fellowship of friends, although at one time he took such delight therein that he could scarcely find time to come home for his meals (3 Soc. 9); for some unknown reason he returned from Spoleto and abandoned the pursuit of the military glory for which he had craved; and even the humanitarianism which induced him to work among the lepers did not provide him with the full satisfaction which he sought. It may be added that he displayed the impulsive activity normally associated with youth; whatever object he was pursuing he never adopted half-measures. He was the leader of his comrades' revels; he devoted much care and expense to the preparations for his Apulian expedition; and he served the lepers with his own hands.

III

But Francis was not concerned merely with self-realization. For him the normal features of adolescent conversion took a mystical turn because of his peculiar character. In the delicacy

of his constitution and in his decided psychopathic tendencies he conforms to the mystic type, but in addition to these tendencies he was strongly influenced by the dramatic and the romantic elements which in his case were remarkably developed. The former of these elements appears in the impulsive acts to which he was addicted; no sooner had he grasped an ideal than he at once took steps to bring the discrepant actuality into accordance with his mental content. He decides that it is an unworthy thing to shrink from lepers, and immediately proceeds to kiss a leper whom he meets by the way; he hears that Christ sent out the disciples without money, shoes, or staves, and forthwith, casting away his purse, shoes, and staff, he dons a scanty tunic with a rope as girdle. The romantic side of his nature is seen in his early desire for military renown and in his love for the French tongue, the language of romance (2 Cel. 13, 127, etc.). "His imagination was impregnate"* with the martial imagery of the *chansons de geste*, and at the head of his *Jongleurs de Dieu* he brought to the service of God all the spontaneous gaiety of

'Dance, and Provençal song, and sunburnt mirth'

with which the troubadours and their satellites were adding a new lightness to the life of the time.

These elements, however, served only to give a strongly individual touch to the mysticism which formed the basis of his character. We have seen that he underwent the change of values customary for the adolescent, but for him the change took the form of a complete upheaval. He came to see that nothing would satisfy him but to forsake everything on which he set store; his true wealth was to be measured in terms of what he could do without. This was no mere abandonment of money, status, and ambitions, but a positive embracing of poverty and lowliness. In the locution which preceded the kissing of the leper, he was bidden to take the bitter instead of the sweet, being assured that to him the former would become delightful and the latter unbearable (2 Cel. 9; 3 Soc. 11); and he embraced the ideal which in due time he hypostatized as the Lady Poverty. This ideal was, of course, connected with the traditional religion which for him had become filled with new life. It was in accordance with the mystic tradition that in this connection he laid emphasis on the individual rather than the corporate side of religion. While he remained a devoted son of the Church, it was from his own individual experiences that he drew his most abiding inspirations. He was conscious of a close personal

* Fr. P. Robinson, "Francis of Assisi" (article in the Catholic Encyclopædia, vol. vi., p. 228).

relationship with the Christ of whose life his own was a passionate imitation; and his everyday actions were a following of the Divine guidance which came to him in prayer and meditation. He is represented as being cheered with revelations (1 Cel. 33), and often admonished by visitations of the Holy Ghost (2 Cel. 9). In his case, however, the typically mystic consciousness of immediate communion with God was united with feelings of love and reverence for the Sacraments and Ministers of the Church, which effectually prevented him from becoming an individualist pure and simple. From his religious emotions his moral virility was derived. To the moral self-hood of the ordinary believer he added the intense moral earnestness of the mystic to whom fleshly desires and worldly possessions are barriers between him and the object of his adoration. He was not merely chaste and honest and charitable; but he rejoiced in the ecstasy of self-immolation which prompted him to kiss the loathsome sores of the lepers, and in the ardour of renunciation which compelled him to cut himself adrift from his family and his fortune. The peculiar strength of his character lies in his capacity for literally practising what he preached, and perhaps his most original trait was the consistency with which he followed poverty as a thing to be sought for in itself. This consistency was made possible because the affective elements of his personality had found an object with which they were satisfied. His personality was stabilized by the redirection to religion of the *libido*, the system of emotional dispositions which had failed to find satisfaction in social pleasures or military ambition. There could be no doubt as to the reality of the satisfaction which he found in religion from the period of his conversion onwards. After the spiritual crisis connected with the kissing of the leper, he was "filled with such joy that he could not contain himself for gladness" (3 Soc. 13; *cf.* 1 Cel. 7); as a result of the locution in St. Damian's he was "filled with joy" and "illumined with light" (3 Soc. 13); when his act of public renunciation was over he retired to the woods near Assisi singing praises (1 Cel. 16); and on hearing at Mass the Gospel account of Apostolic poverty, he "was filled with joy unspeakable" (3 Soc. 25; *cf.* 1 Cel. 22). Henceforward his emotions seem to have been entirely bound up with Christ. When he was not uttering praises he was weeping bitterly over the Passion until "his eyes seemed full of blood" (3 Soc. 14). His response to the Divine love, however, was not merely emotional. He rejoiced in the whole creation as the handiwork of God, and his introversion towards the Divine was followed, as in the case of Teresa and Catharine of Genoa, by extroversion towards the world. His active life was passed in gathering a body of dis-

ciples, in tending and healing the diseased, and in preaching to others the gospel of repentance which he had found in his own case to be the way of peace.

IV

There remains the question as to how far the records indicate that Francis believed that his early struggles were accompanied by visions and locutions. Unlike Paul, he makes no claim in his own writings to have seen the Lord Jesus. The biographies show that he was subject to visions and locutions, and those of his earlier years are either dreams, or "imaginal" experiences in which "the percipient has a clear image of what he sees or hears, but does not suppose it to belong to the outside world."* In the former class may be placed the vision of armour which preceded his Apulian project,† and in the latter the locution in which he heard "in the spirit" God directing him to "take the bitter instead of the sweet."‡ The question arises as to whether the vision and locution in St. Damian's are to be placed in the second of these classes; and an affirmative answer seems to be most in accordance with the evidence. It is true that in 2 Cel. 10 and the 3 Soc. 13 the Image of the Crucified is represented as addressing Francis and bidding him repair the Church, while Bonaventura in a more elaborate narrative states that Francis heard the heavenly voice "with his bodily ears" (Bon. 2; 1). But it has been noted that the experience is not mentioned in Celano's first *Life* (1228), and its introduction into the second *Life*, written nearly twenty years later, justifies a suspicion of the wording of the story as it stands. It is probable that the narrative deals with an authentic incident in the Saint's career which was omitted in the first *Life* owing to defective information, but that, as time went on, the details of the incident were elaborated in the direction of the miraculous. This "inevitable growth of the legendary element"§ may be seen if Bonaventura's account of the incident is compared with that of Celano and the Three Companions. It is probable that this tendency, at work on the episode in St.Damian's, has turned what was at first an "imaginal" vision and locution into a conventional miracle. From the psychological point of view this vision and locution may be explained as due to the activity of the subconscious mind. The experience took place while the Saint was engaged in fervent prayer before the Image of the Crucified. His prayer was probably a request to the Lord to show him what

* R. H. Thouless, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion* (Cambridge, 1924), p. 73. Dr. Thouless does not apply to such experiences the word "imaginary" because "in English it suggests an irrelevant judgment on their reality," p. 73 note.

† 1 Cel. 5; 2 Cel. 6; 3 Soc. 5; Bon, 1: 3. ‡ 2 Cel. 9; *cf.* 3 Soc. 11.

§ A. G. Little, *A Guide to Franciscan Studies*, p. 16.

he must do (*cf.* 3 Soc. 13), and as a result of it he received a command to repair the Church given in the form of an interior or " imaginal " vision and locution. The content of this answer was due to the normal action of reflective auto-suggestion. Francis comes into the ruined Church in a state of doubt and indecision; he fixes his eyes on the Image, and saturates his mind with the thought of the desired command from God, abandoning himself wholly to the Divine Will. He has thus produced the combination of fixity of attention and abandonment of voluntary effort which makes possible effective auto-suggestion of the reflective type. The command comes, and in the circumstances it takes the form of a " pseudo-hallucination " in which the Image of the Crucified directs the Saint to repair the Church.*

It must, of course, be clearly understood that this description of the psychological mechanism underlying the Saint's experiences determines nothing, in itself, as to the question whether or not they were inspired of God. For that purpose we must apply other criteria, such as are discussed at length in the writings of the great mystics like Teresa or John of the Cross. We cannot pursue that question here; but we may say without hesitation that, if the criterion of spiritual and vocational result be applied—and none is more frequently emphasized by these writers—then the whole course of Francis' life points to the conclusion that his visions and locutions were the fruit of the grace of God.

G. J. Inglis.

* Latin texts of the Writings and of the Biographies mentioned are accessible in the following editions: (1) The Writings: H. Boehmer, *Analekten zur Geschichte des Franciscus von Assisi*, S. Francisci Opuscula [etc.]. (Tubingen und Leipzig, 1904.) (2) Celano's *Lives*: S. Francisci Assiensis; Vita et Miracula; Additis Opusculis Liturgicis; Auctore Fr. Thoma de Celano. Hanc editionem novam ad fidem recensuit P. Eduardus Alenconiensis, Ord. Fr. Min. Cap. (Romæ, 1906). (3) *The Three Companions:* La Legenda di San Francesco, scritta da tre suoi Compagni (legenda trium sociorum), pubblicata per la prima volta nella vera sua integrità dai Padri Marcellino da Civezza e Teofilo Domenichelli dei Minori (Roma, 1899). (4) Bonaventura's *Life:* S. Bonaventuræ; Omnia opera; Edita studio et cura P. P. Collegii A. S. Bonaventura (Ad Claras Aquas., 1898), tomus viii. (5) *The Mirror of Perfection:* Speculum Perfectionis; Seu S. Francisci Assisiensis Legenda Antiquissima; Auctore Fratre Leone; Nunc primum edidit P. Sabatier (Paris, 1898).

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The correspondence published below between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of Utrecht with regard to the recognition of Anglican Orders by the Old Catholics signalizes yet another stage on the road to Re-union, and affords yet a fresh indication that the tide of the Spirit which set from the Lambeth Conference of 1920 still runs strong. We can guess how Mr. Gladstone and Dr. Döllinger—and might we add Lord Acton?—would have rejoiced. We hope at an early date to arrange for an article on the history of the Old Catholic movement.

We publish to-day the first of a series of articles by Professor Goudge, based on his lectures to the Oxford School for Clergy last July, and entitled "What is the Gospel?" Two more will follow in November and December. The series is intended to be of especial service to those who have to preach and teach, and should be read as a whole.

We understand that Messrs. Dent will this month issue a translation of *Ruysbroeck the Admirable*, a work by M. d'Aygalliers which was recently crowned by the Académie Française. Those who are familiar with the Dean of St Paul's little anthology entitled *Light, Life and Love* will look forward to this complete edition of one of the greatest of the German mystics of the fourteenth century.

DOCUMENTS

THE OLD CATHOLICS AND ANGLICAN ORDERS

The following letters have recently passed between the Archbishop of Utrecht and the Archbishop of Canterbury.

I

Reverendissimo Domino Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi salutem in Domino.

Felices nos habemus qui gratum Tibi nunciare valemus. Ecclesia vetero-catholica Ultrajectina usque adhuc haesitabat de validitate Ordinum Anglicanorum. De facto consecrationis Parkeri non dubitabat sed de virtute ritualis Eduardi sexti, anxia an illud rituale fidem catholicam satis redderet. Post longam inquisitionem seriamque deliberationem, clero nostro consulto, consilium cepimus, quod hisce litteris Tibi notum facimus.

Credimus ecclesiam Anglicanam regimen episcopale antiquae ecclesiae semper tenere voluisse atque Eduardi sexti consecrationis formulam validam aestimandam esse. Ideo ex animo declaramus successionem apostolicam in ecclesia Anglicana non defecisse.

Magnam gratiam Tibi deprecans salutat Te in Domino,

(*Signed*) ✠ FRANCISCUS KENNINCK,
Archiepiscopus Ultrajectensis.

DATUM ULTRAJECTI,
Die II mensis Junii, anno Domini MDCCCCXXV.

II

REVERENDISSIMO DOMINO FRANCISCO KENNINCK ARCHIEPISCOPO ULTRAJECTENSI SALUTEM IN DOMINO SEMPITERNAM.

Epistulam Tuam accepimus, in qua certiores nos fecistis de iudicio Ecclesiae uetero-Catholicae Ultrajectensis super ualiditate Ordinum Anglicanorum. Apud doctos certe totius orbis theologos maximum habebit pondus, quod Ecclesia uestra post inquisitionem longam, diligentem, accuratam et de facto consecrationis Parkeri et de ualiditate formulae consecrationis Eduardinae non iam dubitat. Nuper uero eandem uariis modis sententiam Ecclesia Orthodoxa Orientalis pronuntiauit.

Nos quidem pro certo habemus et semper habuimus in Ecclesia Anglicana successionem apostolicam numquam defecisse et ualidam semper consecrationis formulam exstitisse, gratia sautem agimus Deo qui tam insigniter demonstrat Suam esse uoluntatem ut Ecclesia Sua tamdiu in partes rescissa tandam coeat. Nos, qui Ecclesiam uetero-Catholicam, tot et tanta pro Catholicae fidei ueritate perpessam, ueneramur et semper uenerati sumus, gaudemus quod posthac nulla dissensionis causa inter nos inuicem manebit, sed in Uerbi et sacramentorum communione ut semper in unitate cordium erimus coniuncti.

Quod ad alios attinet, possumus aequo animo cum Sancto Augustino dicere: " Quod aliter sapuerunt non expauescimus, quia cum eis ueneramur et Petrum; quod autem ab unitate non recesserunt gaudemus, quia cum eis aedificamur in petra."

Salutat te in Domino Saluatore nostro,

(*Signed*) RANDALL CANTUAR.

DATUM LONDINI,
Die xxx*th mensis Julii, A.S. MDCCCCXXV.*

We subjoin below a translation of the letters.

I

To the Most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Greeting in the Lord.

We are in the happy position of being able to send good news to your Grace. The Old Catholic Church of Utrecht has hitherto been in doubt as to the validity of Anglican Orders. Its doubt concerned, not the fact of Parker's consecration, but the sufficiency of the rite of Edward VI as an adequate expression of Catholic belief. After long inquiry and serious deliberation, and after consultation with our clergy, we have reached a decision which we hereby communicate to your Grace.

We believe that the Church of England has wished always to maintain the episcopal rule of the Church of antiquity, and that the Edwardine formula of consecration must be accounted valid. We therefore declare, without reservation, that the apostolic succession has not been broken in the Church of England.

Our prayers and greetings in the Lord.

(*Signed*) ✠ Francis Kenninck,
Archbishop of Utrecht.

Utrecht,
June 2, 1925.

II

To the Most Reverend Lord Francis Kenninck, Archbishop of Utrecht, Greeting ever in the Lord,

We have received your Lordship's letter informing us of the decision of the Old Catholic Church of Utrecht on the validity of Anglican Orders. Theologians of learning throughout the world will assuredly be deeply impressed by the fact that your Church, after long, careful, and accurate inquiry, no longer entertains doubt either as to the fact of Parker's consecration or as to the validity of the Edwardine formula of consecration. The same opinion, moreover, has lately been given in various ways by the Orthodox Eastern Church.

For our own part we are sure, and have always been sure, that the apostolical succession has never been broken in the Church of England, and that a valid formula of consecration has been continually maintained; but we give thanks to God for so signally demonstrating His will that His Church, so long rent asunder, should at length return to unity. The Old Catholic Church, which has suffered so much for the truth of the Catholic faith, commands, and has always commanded, our veneration; and we rejoice that henceforward no cause of dissension will remain between us on either side, but that we shall be joined in the fellowship of the Word and sacraments as we ever have been in unity of heart.

As regards others, we can confidently say with St. Augustine: "We are not alarmed about their differences of opinion because our respect for St. Peter is equal to theirs; but we rejoice that they have remained in the Catholic Church, because we like them are built upon the rock."

Greetings in our Lord and Saviour.

(*Signed*) Randall Cantuar.

London,
July 30, 1925.

NEW MOVEMENTS IN GERMAN THOUGHT

Professor Dibelius of Heidelberg is known to New Testament scholars as a specialist in literary criticism. In his *Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Religion im Christentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 4 M.) he discusses fundamental problems. Without making any attempt to summarize his argument, we emphasize three points in these exceedingly thoughtful and attractive lectures which seem likely to interest English readers.

1. *The Diagnosis of Present Spiritual Movements in Germany.*— Professor Dibelius confines himself to those which appear to have a significance for the future. (This is wiser than taking an existing ideal like Marxian Socialism and assuming that because it has made so much progress it will continue to win adherents, but is open to the obvious criticism that it is easy to over-estimate the importance of possibly ephemeral contemporary movements.) The first is the so-called "youth-movement," *Jugendbewegung*, which has taken an astonishing hold upon young men and women, and is now influencing their elders. This is a return to Nature, a reaction from the "mechanization" of life, which in the realm of knowledge takes the form of specialization, and from the overprizing of material things. It expresses itself outwardly by dances and games in the open air, performed as symbolic acts, as well as by long walks and campings-out, such as the pre-war *Wandervögel* practised so zealously. (It is as if our University students flocked to Hyde Park to perform Morris-dances as an expression of the English soul, without any self-consciousness.) It is claimed that youth is a revelation of divine forces, and is to be cherished as an end in itself. The danger of the movement is flight from the world in place of an attempt to free the world from slavery. Its greatest boon to Germany is "a new purity of relations between the sexes," which has come in no sense as part of a programme, but is a natural growth.

The second movement is *Expressionismus* in Art, which tries to break down barriers between the material and the transcendent by means of hints, allusions and intuitions. Dibelius gives a simple illustration of the change. Twenty five years ago an angel with wings was felt to be repugnant to modern-minded men. It now seems an obvious way of expressing the transcendent.

The third movement is called *Irrationalismus* for want of a better word. There is a mighty growth of groups and organizations of every kind devoted to mysticism, spiritualism, theosophy, "anthroposophy." The significant thing is that the tendency is strongest among merchants, technicians, and the industrialized classes generally rather than among those of academic culture. The three movements are closely connected, the common factor being the exaltation of intuition at the expense of reason. If the picture drawn of modern Germany is even approximately correct, our popular press has misled us seriously.

2. *A New View of Our Lord.* The hardest task of the theologian is to connect the Christ of the "Christ-myth" with the historical Jesus. (German writers use myth in a neutral sense, not intending to prejudge the question whether or not the "Christ-myth" is a true interpretation

of the facts.) Dibelius is much influenced by Otto's doctrine of "the Holy," now so well known in England; also by Barth and his school, who insist that the Gospel is something "wholly other." He defines the Gospel as the breaking through of other-worldly reality in the person of Jesus. We Western men have no vocabulary with which to describe Jesus. Our concepts, based ultimately on Greek thought, are too intellectual. We instinctively imagine Jesus discoursing with His disciples like a Socrates. In fact, He was neither a Rabbi disputing, nor a leader with a following, nor a prophet to be believed, but a Holy Man, round whom His disciples clustered in awe, seeing in Him an intimation of eternity. We may imagine them very often silent before Him and only rarely daring to ask a question. The recorded sayings of Jesus are not conversations, but short pronouncements called forth by specific occasions.* A most significant passage is Mark x. 32: "Jesus was going before them; and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid." In short—and the word is now inevitable—Jesus was "numinous." Dibelius does not pretend to *prove* his position; the evidence is insufficient. But anyone reading St Mark again, keeping this idea in mind, and looking out for words like φοβεῖσθαι, θαμβεῖσθαι, etc., will be surprised to find how well it fits the facts. And it is an enormous help in explaining the attribution of divine traits to Jesus immediately after the Crucifixion if He had been known to the disciples not as a sociable Comrade but as a Figure shrouded in mystery and regarded with awe.

3. *The Contrast between Catholicism and Protestantism.* Dibelius makes some excellent remarks on this. The Protestant has his religious life in the world in which he lives and which he tries to influence. The Catholic aims at forming a "Catholic world" in which to live. For example, it is essential to Catholic culture that there should be Catholic teaching of history: no Protestant would dream of asking for Protestant history. But the real divergence in the modern world is in the realm of cultus. For the Catholic worship is the showing of the eternal in reality not in symbol, though the reality exists only for the believer. Traditional Protestant worship practically consists of preaching, and nowadays, when the pulpit has so many rivals, is justified only when the preacher has exceptional personal gifts. No purpose would be served by imitating Catholic ways without the Catholic conception of *holiness* (Otto's idea of "the numinous" must be read into this word). But it must be recognized that Protestantism is saddled with a wholly inadequate ideal of worship, inherited from the seventeenth-century Epigoni of the mighty Luther.

Time was when German theology was a bugbear to the orthodox in England. As things are to-day we can only wish that all English Churchmen would study its latest developments. Some of our difficulties would be eased.

W. K. L. C.

* A striking confirmation of the view that silence would be expected in a Holy Man is provided by Acts xiv. 12, where the men of Lystra call Paul, who has preached and healed a man, Hermes the messenger of the gods, and Barnabas, who has remained in the background, the supreme god Zeus.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,

1. Dr. Bindley does not mention the reference to *Wisdom* xi. 24 in the Ash Wednesday Collect. If *lex orandi* in this case is *lex credendi*, it is a comfort to be reminded some hundred times every Lent that the doctrine of the Church of England is that God hateth nothing that he hath made.

2. Might not Mr. Robinson have added to the list of "blunders" in the Revised Lectionary the provision, without alternative, of the same First Lesson for Mattins on Palm Sunday and Evensong on Good Friday?

Yours faithfully,

W. H. WHITING.

WOKINGHAM.

SIR,

Mr. Baker's criticism of the Student Christian Movement in your August number should not, I feel, be allowed to pass without comment. Some of his sentences are less than fair to the Movement. Of course, "interdenominationalism" is difficult, but that is no reason why it should not be attempted; my own personal observation of the proceedings (for what it is worth) of the Manchester Conference last January and a recent Swanwick Conference assured me that the Student Movement is expressing the right kind of interdenominationalism with great wisdom and a large measure of success. There were certainly Roman Catholic members of the movement at Manchester and, I believe, at Swanwick; a very large number of men and women who would describe themselves as "Anglo-Catholics" are keen members, working with and for the movement, without any danger to their own religious convictions. The Movement is very distinctly and designedly *not* "one sect among the sects." I am persuaded that we ought to thank God constantly for its work and for the way in which it is directed. It is one of the most hopeful and fruitful movements for good in the world to-day. It was a real occasion of pain to find it so summarily criticized in the generally temperate pages of THEOLOGY.

Yours faithfully,

JAMES B. SEATON.

CUDDESDON.

SIR,

Desuetude in Canon Law.—The holiday, when one is away from books and cannot quote accurately or give references, is a bad time to deal with such matters, but I should like to be allowed to say a word about "Desuetude" while the subject is still fresh in the minds of your readers.

"Desuetude" in the sense of disuse plus the establishment of a contrary custom was generally admitted as abrogating a provision of the Canon Law in the Middle Ages.

It did not operate, however, anything like as freely as the Bishop of Southwark appears to think.

It was hedged round with restrictions to which the Bishop refers, but on which he does not dwell. In this you seem to me to have followed him, although Canon Ackerley in his note, the original draft of which he kindly allowed me to read, does give full weight to these restrictions.

The all-important fact which has been overlooked by the Bishop of Southwark, and I think also by Canon Ackerley (in his case possibly because it does not affect the question of the fast before Communion with which he is concerned), is that there is no comparison between the practice under the English Mediæval Canon Law or the "Western" Canon Law, mediæval or modern, and the Canon Law of the English Church since the Reformation.

For by the Statute of 1534 the Canon Law as codified by Lyndwood was with certain specified exceptions given the force of statute law, and at the same time the method of repeal was provided for.

The existing law was to remain in force until it was reviewed, and if necessary amended, by a commission of thirty-two persons, the appointment of which the Act contemplates as about to take place without delay.

I submit that according to any known method of interpreting statutes this does away altogether with "Desuetude" as an effective method of appeal.

Provision for amendment or repeal by commission does not rule out repeal by an authority equal to that which enacted the statute, for no Act of Parliament can safeguard itself against repeal. Changes in the Canon Law can take place and have taken place, as in the matter of Clerical Marriage, by Act of Parliament with the concurrence of Convocation, or by Canon of Convocation with the assent of the Crown, but not in any other way.

The enthusiasts who preach to us the subservience of the Church to the law of the land cannot have it both ways. The Statute of 1534 is as much the law of the land as any other Act of Parliament. The Canon Law cannot be put out of court, therefore, with a mere shrug of the shoulders.

Yours, etc.,

H. Chalmer Bell.

Kenwgu, Bude.
August 26, 1926.

THE REAL QUESTION AT THE SYNOD OF WHITBY

In the August number of Theology Mr. C. B. Moss, reviewing my recently published lecture on "The Life and Work of St. Wilfrid of Ripon," accuses me, "perhaps unconsciously," of misleading my hearers and readers on the question of the Whitby Decision: the only question raised, says Mr. Moss, was that of the date of Easter. "To say, as Mr. Fletcher does," Mr. Moss continues, "that St. Wilfrid 'united what had been until then a merely local church with the great Church of the Apostles' is misleading. Nor did the English Church accept the 'papal supremacy' in consequence of anything St. Wilfrid did. The question decided at Whitby was simply this: Should Northumbria continue to use the old-fashioned kalendar of Iona, or adopt the kalendar used everywhere outside the British Isles? St. Wilfrid's appeal to Rome did not mean more, at that period, than Bishop Weston's appeal to Canterbury about Kikuyu." Mr. Moss contents himself with individual affirmation, and gives no authorities in support of his view—I gave several authorities in support of mine—Hunt, Gwatkin, Bright, Creighton. And I will now invite Mr. Moss's attention to the following passages from the late Bishop Lightfoot's sermon on "The Celtic Mission," which forms the first chapter of his book

—*Leaders in the Northern Church*: "The rivalry between Rome and Iona came to a head [at Whitby]. The dispute was about matters unimportant in themselves. There was the cut of the tonsure, a wholly trivial matter, in which there could not be a right or a wrong. There was the time of the Easter celebration, which was a question of convenience rather than principle. *The real issue lay behind all these petty disputes. It was the alternative of allegiance to Rome or allegiance to Iona.*" Then Bishop Lightfoot, having specified the decision—*i.e.*, submission to Rome—proceeds to enlarge on its "great and immediate practical advantages." "To be united with Rome," he says, "was to be connected with the centre of the highest Christian civilization and art of the age. . . . Christian Rome had inherited from heathen Rome her great capacity for organization; and just here lay the main defect of the Celtic churches. . . . The English subjugation [*sic*] brought with it the Roman ascendancy . . . the connection with Rome supplied the element of progress which at this moment the Celtic Churches most needed. Moreover, the Roman submission brought one other paramount advantage: the development of England required unity." And Bishop Lightfoot concludes: "These immediate advantages were so tangible and so patent that it is no surprise to find men like Benedict Biscop and Chad and Bede welcoming the Roman submission." I will leave readers of THEOLOGY to decide between Bishop Lightfoot and Mr. Moss.

J. S. FLETCHER.

NOTE

IMPOSITION OF HANDS IN THE CONSECRATION PRAYER

IN our present Communion office the rubrics that the priest is "here to lay his hand upon all the Bread," "and here to lay his hand upon every vessel," appear to be worded with particular emphasis. They receive, however, but little attention, although they were of novel introduction. What is their import? "It is peculiar to this celebration," says Bishop Cosin, "that the death of Our Lord is commemorated therein, not by bare words, as in other prayers, but by certain sacred symbols, signs and sacraments, which are, according to St. Austin, a sort of visible words." It would seem, therefore, that in the mind of Bishop Cosin the imposition of hands was significant and symbolic. The act forms no part of the Institution in any of the accounts of It in Scripture. Our Lord is only said to have taken the Bread and blessed (or given thanks) and broken It. The definite instruction, therefore, to the priest seems almost of the nature of an addition, as though it were necessary for us to do something which was not requisite in the case of Christ.

The most natural interpretation of the imposition of hands on the elements is simply consecration. The general meaning of the imposition of hands, as Kurtz shows (*Sacrifices of O.T.*), is consecration or dedication to a new status. And with the omission of the ἐπίκλησις the act might be regarded as a kind of "visible word" of invocation atoning for a defect, seeing that for us the laying on of hands is so closely connected with the operations of the Holy Ghost. We do not pray that God would "vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy Word and Holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine" that they may become the Body

and Blood, but one who has received the Holy Ghost performs an act which is a clear reminder of Him.

But this imposition of hands in the sacrament of the Death of Christ may also look back to the imposition of hands in the O.T. sacrifices, more especially to the Day of Atonement. The scapegoat was made the sin-bearer of the (forgiven) sins of the people (*vide* Kurtz *ad loc.*). In the Liturgy of St. James prayer is made that the hallowed elements "may be to those that partake of them for remission of sins and for eternal life." May we not, therefore, see an additional significance in the rite? We desire that Christ, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, should be our Sin-bearer, and the Church may be said—especially with the Confession and Absolution and Comfortable Words in their present position—spiritually to set Him apart to that office in the Sacrament. On the Day of Atonement the imposition of hands carried with it the idea of substitution, the goat receiving the sinful status of those whose sins were confessed over it. In the Christian sacrifice is not Christ made sin for us, bearing the sin of many and making intercession for the transgressors?

G. S. Richards.

REVIEWS

THE ASCETIC WORKS OF SAINT BASIL. Translated into English with Introduction and Notes by W. K. L. Clarke, D.D. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

The great figure of St. Basil has attracted to itself much attention in recent years, in England as also abroad. It was a curious coincidence that two such books as Mr. Morison's *St. Basil and His Rule* and Mr. Clarke's *St. Basil the Great: A Study of Monasticism*, should have appeared within a year of one another, one emanating from Oxford and the other from Cambridge. The cause of this is the widespread interest now shown in monasticism, and particularly in its early history: both books by their titles indicate this. It is not St. Basil the theologian, nor St. Basil the bishop, that has won this homage: but St. Basil the Father of Monks. This title is justified. St. Basil was not a founder of a monastic order like Pachomius or Benedict. He found monasticism existing and he studied it. This study won him to adopt the monastic calling himself, to propagate it with zeal, and direct it with great and well deserved spiritual authority. But its main characteristics were already fixed in two or three similar but distinct moulds. There was common to all forms three main things: first, a desire for renunciation of the world; second, a spirit of deference and discipleship towards great spiritual leaders or athletes; and third, a resultant atmosphere and temperament, which alone united the various forms of the development and gave unity to a very diverse group of developments.

Given the first of these, the aspirant's immediate preoccupation was to find the man under whom to place himself—not the place in which to make his home, still less the system into which he should enter. His *guru* might be a hermit, in which case he would attach himself to him as *chela*, and put up a cell for himself as near to the great man as he might be allowed. Or the *guru* might be a leader of corporate life; in which case he would get or build a cell for himself in one of the *cenobia* which the great man visited or directed. He might easily pass from one condition to the other: or he might in time himself become just such a leader in one or other capacity. The general outline of what was involved in any case was well known. It was common property: it was an infectious enthusiasm that was spreading everywhere. If the monk tired of this or that master he chose another; if the study of comparative piety interested him he might travel widely and find himself everywhere in the same atmosphere. If his own devotion evaporated in the process he became the wandering monk, the black sheep, and the despair of every leader.

This monastic institution was thus an untidy one: enthusiasm rather than uniform order bound it together. It was the age of experiment, and settled principles, such as later the tidy mind of the West should evolve—the conception of *Stabilitas* or the rule of *nihil proprium*—had not yet emerged.

Dr. Lowther Clarke had already done much to make this monastic world of the fourth century accessible to the English reader. He followed up his book on St. Basil by a translation of the Life of his sister Macrina written by his brother, St. Gregory of Nyssa (S.P.C.K., 1916); and that

again by his translation of *The Lausiac History* of Palladius (S.P.C.K., 1918). Now we have the successor of these in his translation of the *Ascetic Works of St. Basil*, a very substantial work containing Introduction, Notes, and Index, besides a very readable translation. It is a great gain to have so much so well done.

We may take Dr. Clarke's judgment as to which are the genuine writings of St. Basil in the group of *Ascetica* which pass under his name. Five of them are unassailable, and these form the *corpus* of St. Basil's ascetic work. Of the rest of the seven pieces three may be genuine and two are surely not. The five that may be so are therefore included in this volume.

What, then, was the place and work of Basil in regard to monasticism? The question is easier to ask than to answer. He was himself a monk, but he cannot have conformed to strict rules of cloister and the like. His activities and journeys were many: for the last eight years of his life he was Bishop of Cæsarea, and for some years previously he had stood behind his predecessor Eusebius. Any monk had to carry his cloister within him in those days, if he went into town life, for monasteries were essentially retired spots, out of harm's way. They had not yet been opened in towns; indeed, Basil's own view seems to have been that monastic life was incompatible with town life. What, therefore, his own monastic observance was we can hardly say.

But we may see that Basil's heart was in his monastery, and that one of his supreme interests was to discipline and utilize the growing tide of monastic enthusiasm, as yet untamed and unharnessed. He saw its possibilities, he knew its dangers. He organized, encouraged, directed, popularized.

The five treatises of the *Corpus* form a more or less orderly group, beginning with a "Prelude" on Judgment, and continuing with a brief dogmatic summary, but consisting mainly of a treatise on Christian Ethics or Morals, followed by two sets of *Casus conscientiæ*, mainly monastic. There is no "Rule of St. Basil," properly speaking; the nature of his monasteries, the principles by which they are to be governed, the officers that govern them, the prayer, work, and organization—these things do but emerge incidentally and partially from the two books of the Longer and Shorter Rules. These, for clearness' sake, should be called Directions rather than Rules; they are the replies of a Director to questions and problems, not a code laid down for the governance of a monastery by its Founder.

As such they are much more interesting to the general public than any monastic rule can be. Problems of conduct beset us all; and though a strong claustral flavour attaches to some of these questions—*e.g.*, "Should the sister who does not want to sing psalms be compelled to do so?"—the greater number of them involve principles of quite general Christian application. The replies and directions given in the 55 "Longer Rules" are more homiletic in character than those in the 313 "Shorter Rules," which are often epigrammatic and even curt. But from both alike the quality of St. Basil emerges; and in it three things are prominent: (i.) a shrewd common sense, (ii.) a clear spiritual perception, and (iii.) a whole-hearted reliance on the Bible.

Enough has been said, it may be hoped, to point out the attractiveness of this book, and to commend it to a wide circle of readers. It does not supersede the biographical part, so charmingly done, of Dr. Clarke's

earlier book, *St. Basil the Great;* nor does either of these deal with the greatness of the saint in all his various activities. In emphasizing above the widely appealing character of his Morals and spiritual direction, it must not be forgotten that for the specialist, or even for the general reader who wishes to understand monasticism, these documents are indispensable; and, more than that, they abound in delicate sketches of monastic life and character, all the more delightful because they are often so elusive, and leave the reader, like Parsifal at the Castle, puzzled on the edge of a mysterious attraction.

WALTERUS TRURON.

THE LIFE OF ST. SAMSON OF DOL. By Thomas Taylor, B.D. S.P.C.K. Translations of Christian Literature, 1925. 5s.

St. Samson is remembered as the founder of the Breton monastery of Dol. Churches were built in his honour both in Brittany and in Cornwall, while to this day a menhir near Dinan and a parish near Fowey bear his name. He was born in South Wales, probably in A.D. 486, and was educated at St. Iltut's school at Llantwit, where he was ordained deacon and priest. In obedience to a heavenly call he went to the monastery of Piro, whom he soon succeeded as abbot. After a visit to Ireland and a retreat to the banks of the Severn he was ordained bishop (521), whereupon he sailed to Cornwall and thence to Brittany, where he died after completing "all the mighty works which God wrought by him both in Brittany and Romania." The saint's anonymous biographer states that he derived his information from a Life written by Henoc (the saint's nephew), and also from oral information. The Abbé Duine and Professor Loth have upheld the genuineness of the Life in opposition to M. Fawtier, who regards it as spurious.

Canon Taylor's Introduction deals briefly with some characteristics of the Celtic churches and with the early ecclesiastical history of Brittany. Two useful maps show the tribal divisions of Armorica in the fourth century and the dioceses of Brittany in the sixth. The founders of the Breton bishoprics were all monks of British origin: St. Samson (Dol), St. Paul Aurelian (Léon), St. Tutwall (Tréguier), St. Corentin (Quimper), St. Brieuc, and St. Malo. The *Life of St. Samson* is valuable for the light it throws on Celtic folklore as well as Celtic monasticism. We read an extraordinary story of a fire-spitting serpent which St. Samson ordered to die in his presence that very hour; "at once the serpent stood on its tail, and raising its head aloft and absurdly making a bow of itself, cast forth all its venom and was dead."

It is regrettable that a good piece of editorial work should be marred by slips such as "Haddon" for "Haddan" (p. viii, *n.* 1), "Namnites" for "Namnetes" (p. xxix), "autocthonous" for "autochthonous" (p. xxxvii), "gestæ emendatioræ" for "gesta emendatiora" (p. 8, *n.* 3), "consiliari," for "consiliarii" (p. 45, *n.* 3), 591 as the first year of Gregory the Great's pontificate instead of 590 (p. 64, *n.* 2). The year when Christianity became the State religion is given as 386 on p. vi and 392 on p. xxiv.

CAROLINE A. J. SKEEL.

THE DOMINICAN ORDER IN ENGLAND BEFORE THE REFORMATION. By Beryl E. R. Formoy. S.P.C.K. 1925. 6s.

The intention of this little book is to arouse readers to "fresh interest in the Dominicans in England and appreciation of their work." It suffers from having been written before the publication of Father Bede Jarrett's work on the same subject, but in some respects it is a useful supplement. The organization and daily life of the Dominicans are clearly sketched, also their relations with other religious organizations and their political and educational activities. Particularly interesting are the chapters on the Dominican Second Order and the house of the Dominican Sisters at Dartford. An appendix gives several well-chosen extracts from original authorities.

Mrs. Fermoy's book gives proof of industry and wide reading. It is therefore all the more regrettable that before publication she did not submit her MS. to a rigorous revision. Her well-planned list of authorities is marred by the use of the word "transcriptions" for "transcripts" (p. ix), and by the novel and unsatisfactory abbreviations "Cal. of Close," "Cal. of Pat.," "Cal. of Pap. Letters." On the whole the book is well documented, but there are inadequate references such as that on p. 87, "D.N.B., p. 415," and that on p. 114, "Rymer Fœdera III." Titles of books are sometimes given incorrectly. Pollock and Maitland wrote a *History of English Law*, not a *Legal History;* Sir Harris Nicolas' name is always a trap to the unwary, but he has fared worse than usual in the reference on p. 77, "Nicholas, *Testamenta Vetustata*." There are too many uncorrected printer's errors, such as "Osmey" for "Oseney" (p. 64) and "art school" for "arts school" (p. 91). Worst of all are the egregious mistakes in Latin, especially in the Appendix. The following may serve as samples: "Episcopeo Vintoniensium" (p. 135), "exisimarunt," "exortælites" (p. 136), "per predictis" (p. 136), "in quadam litteras" (p. 137), "Kucolirensis Diecesis" (for "Lincolniensis Diocesis," p. 154). A list of errata should be inserted in order to make the Appendix serviceable to scholars, and to save the general reader from supposing that Kilwardby discoursed on "Philosophia Rerum Humanorum" or that the Oxford Convent surrendered in 1538 to *Messrs.* Banaster, Pye and Fryer.

CAROLINE A. J. SKEEL.

THE REFORMATION IN NORTHERN ENGLAND. By J. S. Fletcher. London: George Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d. net.

That prolific writer, Mr. J. S. Fletcher (for I presume this historian is the same person as the thrilling story-teller), has now published a series of lectures on the Reformation in Northern England. All his good qualities of vivacity and enthusiasm, clear opinion and direct expression, are shown in this book. He delights to tell a story, and he tells one delightfully well. His lectures must have been most interesting to hear; and, as a popularization of the view (for which there is a great deal to be said) that the Reformation in England was a political act carried out by wicked men, it must be regarded as highly successful. But it has, inevitably, "the defects of its qualities." It reads too much like the address of a prosecuting counsel. The view is that the Reformation was wholly unpopular and largely heretical, and the laity who supported it did so entirely

from political or mercenary reasons, and the clergy who accepted it were simply greedy or terrorized time-servers. The weakness of this view is simply that it is not true. And when Mr. Fletcher says that Northern England was "to a man against" the Reformation he forgets that the great Bishop Tunstall accepted it and repudiated the papal supremacy, and that the holiest of all the parish priests, Bernard Gilpin, preached the Catholic Faith and ministered the Sacraments, all through the changes, in the Church of England. Nor is it true that there was "not one honest attempt" to bring about reasonable relations between England and the Holy See, or that Elizabeth put to death after the Northern Rebellion for religious reasons far more than Mary did in all her reign. Mr. Fletcher would have done well to study Bishop W. E. Collins's admirable paper on that Rebellion and its consequences. There is, in fact, in popular lectures an inevitable tendency to exaggeration: this is seen in the statement that Wolsey was "probably the ablest man that our race has ever produced," which one is tempted to describe as ridiculous. Briefly, the book is interesting and bright, and it puts a point of view that needs putting; but historically it needs very considerable addition.

W. H. Hutton.

Paul of Tarsus. By T. R. Glover. Student Christian Movement. 9s.

It is a little hard to review Dr. Glover's study of St. Paul without a lurking fear that we may be doing the author a rather serious injustice. If his intention is to present the members of the Student Christian Movement with a piece of popular hagiology, calculated to foster devotion to the figure of St. Paul as conceived by traditional Protestantism, it would be ungenerous to examine it too minutely. The style is sometimes irritating, but undiluted panegyric inevitably tends to pall on the reader. There are occasional lapses into pure vulgarity, as when he writes: "When he [St. Paul] boxes he will not waste his blows on the air; the other man shall know that he can punch (so men found who ventured on controversy with him)." But from this point of view the book will pass. The late Father Rawlinson once remarked to me: "Most people seem to think that St. Paul was just like a typical Anglican clergyman; I'm sure he wasn't." The same holds good if we substitute the words "S.C.M. leader" for Anglican clergyman; but it would be unfair to criticize Dr. Glover too severely for portraying him in this light if his object is to foster the devotion of the Movement to St. Paul.

On the other hand, it might fairly be urged that we have a right to look for something more serious from the Public Orator of the University of Cambridge. And if his book is to be regarded as a serious contribution to Pauline literature, it has to be said that the book falls into the category of those old-fashioned commentaries which thought it possible to expound the New Testament by parallels from classical literature. Dr. Glover shows a very inadequate acquaintance with the contemporary literature of Judaism, and also with the Hellenistic theology of the New Testament period. For instance, the reference to the stadium in 1 Cor. ix. 24 is used to show that St. Paul had been educated in the Hellenic atmosphere of Tarsus; but the metaphor of the stadium appears in so thoroughly Jewish a writing as 4 Esdras (vii. 127), and, what is more, it is really to the point there, whereas in 1 Cor. it is not. This is merely a specimen

of a complete underestimate of the essentially Jewish nature of St. Paul's outlook; Dr. Glover is surprised at his taking the Nazarite Christians of Jerusalem into the Temple, an action entirely consistent with St. Paul's lifelong observance of the strictest Pharisaism; he finds it difficult to realize that he practised "speaking with tongues" as if this were not a regular feature of Pauline Christianity. Even where he recognizes St. Paul's use of conventional Jewish methods of exegesis of the Old Testament he is prepared to write: "While probably doubts as to the validity of the method hardly crossed his mind, it is only occasionally that he uses it, and rarely to establish any point of first importance. When he comes to what is fundamental, he turns (probably) unconsciously, but by instinct, to his own experience." Yet the whole argument of Rom. iv. and Gal. iii. depends on his utterly rabbinical exposition of the text: "Abraham believed in God and it was accounted unto him for righteousness," and here, if anywhere, we have a vital point of Pauline theology.

It would be easy but uncongenial to multiply instances of errors of this kind. Enough has been said to show that as a contribution to Pauline scholarship Dr. Glover has nothing to give us. If he only intended to write conventional hagiology we offer him our apologies.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

MORE PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By T. W. Pym. S.C.M. 4s. 6d.

The theories and practices associated with Auto-suggestion and Psycho-analysis have hardly, as yet, emerged from the experimental stage, and we must wait until they do for the really authoritative book on Psychology and Religion. The writing of it may well prove the life-work of one man. It would be disastrous, however, if the work of contemporary psychologists—the results of which get down to the man in the street more quickly than those in any other branch of science—were to go on unconsidered and unexamined by theologians; and we do not wholly regret, therefore, the unceasing spate of "little books" which approach psychology from the standpoint of religion, and religion from that of psychology. There will be little dispute, we think, that, when allowance is made for its deliberate limitations, Canon Pym's is easily the best, as it is the latest of these *opuscula*. The author is concerned chiefly with the imagination, and its influence on man's behaviour in general, and his religion in particular. There is naturally a good deal about auto-suggestion, and we think Canon Pym triumphantly vindicates its right to be utilized in the devotional life, meeting patiently and successfully one after another of the common objections to it. He rightly insists, more than once, that religious auto-suggestion is never to be *substituted* "for prayer or for any of the stages of spiritual progress directed by the Church. . . . Indeed, religion as the background and source of the practice of auto-suggestion may alone make it both safe and effective in the sphere of moral character." That is wisely said. The danger of religious auto-suggestion apart from the activity of the will in penitence and prayer is analogous to the danger, in some cases, of psychotherapeutic suggestion without analysis. Canon Pym is no advocate of superficial methods of devotion, and his remarks on self-examination in this connection are especially valuable. On the other hand, we like his insistence throughout on the

importance of a positive and not a merely negative ideal, and on the importance of our accepting what he calls God's "picture" of ourselves as our own picture of ourselves. "God when He looks on me sees good, as He sees good in all men. Love is like that. However little there is of good in any man, Love sees it first, Love sees all of it, and Love sees it all the time. Love sees evil as well, but that is a side of truth that in some connections has received an emphasis at the cost of due attention to this other." This is a virile, stimulating, and deeply thoughtful book, and we hope it will be very widely read.

C. E. HUDSON.

BOOK NOTES

Draw Nigh to God. By G. W. Hart, C.R. Mowbrays. 2s. A course of Lent sermons on the holy Gospels for the six Sundays, together with an address to the Guild of the Love of God preached at All Saints, Margaret Street. Father Hart's teaching is simple and devotional; the book will be found helpful for Lenten reading. *What I Believe and Why I Believe it.* By J. H. Beibitz. Mowbrays. 2s. 6d. This practical statement of the grounds of belief in the essentials of the faith thoroughly deserves the commendation which Bishop Ryle bestows upon it. The teaching is sound, well proportioned, and clear, and, considering the quality of the matter, the book is remarkably cheap. *The Collegiate Church and Parish of St. Mary, Port Elizabeth.* By the late Archdeacon Wirgman and Canon C. E. Mayo. Longmans. 6s. To Archdeacon Wirgman's account of this church from its erection in 1825 until the year 1892 Canon Mayo adds the parochial record for the period 1893 to 1924, in view of the commemoration of the centenary in October next. There is a good deal that is of more than parochial interest in the book, and the record is well illustrated. *What is the Church?* By G. Lanchester King, D.D. Heffer. 3s. 6d. The Christian life is here presented by Bishop King with the quiet, winning persuasiveness of one who has long known and valued the privileges of Catholic fellowship and seeks to extend them to others. He treats especially of the supernatural quality of life in the Church, and yet succeeds in presenting it as the most natural thing in the world, as indeed it is. *The Virgin Birth.* By Frederic Palmer, D.D. The Macmillan Co. 3s. 6d. The writer finds a place for the miraculous in history, but rejects the Virgin Birth because "it is not supernatural enough." In his opinion "it is in no way connected with the divinity of Jesus, unless we regard that divinity as material." He contends that the recitation of the Creed is wholly justified where there is acceptance of its spirit though not of its intellectual content. *Creeds and Loyalty.* By Seven Members of the Faculty of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts. The Macmillan Co. 7s. Here, again, the Virgin Birth is rejected, and the resurrection of the body likewise. In a series of independent essays the writers consider the historical foundations of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds and their past and present use, and together they plead that these Creeds shall not be regarded as a test of loyal membership in the Church. The Creeds are recognized as having value as a theological norm, and it is apparently assumed that, while all Christians are to be allowed to modify them for themselves according to taste, there will remain a body of people at the centre who really believe in them and maintain the continuity of

the Church. But this is rather like pleading for the principle of non-resistance in the moral sphere, while relying upon the ultimate force of organized society in the background. *The Imperial Voice.* By L. H. Hough, Th.D., D.D. The Macmillan Co. 7s. Eighteen non-doctrinal sermons and addresses, delivered by the pastor of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church of Detroit, some in England, the rest in Canada and the States. "At all costs," he says in one address, "the mind of the preacher must be kept gladly human and zestfully responsive to all the varied appeals of the human story as it unfolds before his eyes." This the writer has succeeded in achieving for himself. The sermons are all close to life, wide in their range of subject, and unusually complete in treatment. *The Christian Church in the Modern World.* By Raymond Calkins. The Macmillan Co. 8s. All the charges brought against the Church to-day and all the suggestions offered by those who would bring it up to date are sympathetically examined by the writer in this remarkably comprehensive and able defence of organized Christianity. He has Americans mainly in view, but his work bears with scarcely less directness on European conditions, and use is made of English theological writers. "Does not the call come to-day," appeals the author, "to every sound man to forsake his attitude of aloofness and to lay aside the rôle of the critic and to cast in his lot and his life with the Church which has preserved for over nineteen centuries the standards by which its own shortcomings are to be judged?" *Where Evolution and Religion Meet.* By John M. Coulter and Merle C. Coulter. The Macmillan Co. 6s. The Professor and Head of the Department of Botany and the Assistant Professor of Plant Genetics at the University of Chicago collaborate in an attempt "to perform, in some measure, the service of informing the public concerning the present status of evolution." This they do, clearly and simply, in untechnical language, in a book of 105 pages, the last eight of which treat of evolution and religion. *Why I Believe in Religion.* By C. R. Brown. The Macmillan Co. 7s. In six lectures—the Washington Gladden Lectures for 1923—the Dean of the Divinity School, Yale University, declares "for everyday people" the grounds of his belief in God, Christ, Atonement, Prayer, the Bible, and the Future Life. The sacramental life is omitted, but what is provided will commend itself to all earnest readers as the sound, honest, reliable instruction of a man of faith and wisdom. *Religion in the Thought of To-day.* By Carl S. Patton. The Macmillan Co. 7s. This is probably a fair statement of much that finds acceptance to-day as Christianity in modern dress. In the compass of five lectures the author gives, in a popular and interesting way, a great deal of information concerning Evolution, Biblical Criticism, and Philosophical and Theological Thought. Authority and dogma have entirely disappeared; all is up to date and understandable. "Doctrines, more or less elaborate, and more or fewer in number, we shall always have, in religion as in science and philosophy. But increasingly they will be matters of individual preference and interpretation." *The Prayer-Book Dictionary.* Second edition, Vol. I., Part I., pp. 1-96. Pitman. 2s. 6d. each fortnightly part. This useful work is being re-issued, both in a single volume and in parts, the whole having been carefully revised and a number of helpful illustrations added.

O. H.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER